



**Proceedings of the
65th ANNUAL CONVENTION**

NCAA

HOUSTON, TEXAS / JANUARY 11-13, 1971

1971 NCAA CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

*Proceedings
of the*
**65th Annual
Convention**
of the
**National Collegiate
Athletic Association**

Astroworld Hotel
Houston, Texas
January 11-13, 1971



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

1221 Baltimore Avenue

816/474-4600

Kansas City, Missouri 64105

September 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Register, 1971

Administrative Organization	5
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working News Media	9

II. Proceedings of the 65th Annual Convention

Opening Business Session

1. Opening Remarks	20
2. Report of the Secretary-Treasurer	21
3. Explanation of Voting Procedures	23
4. Report of the Executive Committee	24
5. Report of the Council	27
6. Report of the Committee on Memorial Resolutions	30

Faculty Representatives-Athletic Directors Round Table

Monday—Report of the Financial Aid Committee	33
Tuesday—Drug Education	59

Honors Luncheon

Introduction of Toastmaster	77
Introduction of Postgraduate Scholarship Winners	80

Presentation of Special Award

Introduction of Medal of Honor Winners.....	83
Presentation of Theodore Roosevelt Award	89

Continuance of Business Session

7. Report of the Television Committee	94
8. Proposed Amendments	

Awards	96
Principles Governing Financial Aid	96
Summer Basketball	97
Soccer	99
Interpretations	99
Transportation, Visitations and Entertainment	101
Postseason Football Contests	101
Freshman Rule	102
Basketball Playing Season	105
Freshman Rule	106
Alien Student-Athletes	108
Waivers	108

Institutional Eligibility for NCAA Events	108
1.600 Rule	108
Definition of Student-Athlete	111
1.600 Rule	114
Transfers of Membership	115
Committees	115
Rules Committees	115
9. Review of Interpretations	
Ice Hockey Eligibility	121
Membership	122
Site of High School Competition	122
Football Playing Season	122
Transfer Rule	123
1.600 Rule	123
10. Other Proposals	
1.600 Resolution	123
Drug Resolution	125
Revisions of Executive Regulations	125
Recommended Policies	126
Constitution and Bylaws Resolution	126
Transfer Rule	127
11. Report of the Committee on Committees	127
12. Report of the Nominating Committee	127

III. Appendices

Appendix A

Proposed Amendments	A- 1
Review of Interpretations	A-14
Other Proposals	A-21

Appendix B

Convention Committees	A-26
-----------------------------	------

Appendix C

Past and Present Officers of the NCAA	A-28
---	------

Appendix D

NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1973	A-29
--	------

1971 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

NCAA Officers

President

EARL M. RAMER

Department of Continuing and Higher Education—13 Henson Hall
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn. 37916

Secretary-Treasurer

SAMUEL E. BARNES, Professor of Physical Education
District of Columbia Teachers College, Washington, D. C. 20009

Executive Director

WALTER BYERS, 1221 Baltimore Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri 64105

The Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chairman and secretary, respectively. Nine members of the Council are the eight district vice-presidents and the vice-president-at-large, each of whom is elected for two years and may be immediately reelected for one additional term. Seven members are elected at-large for terms of three years and may not be reelected until three years have elapsed.

District 1 Vice-President—Robert W. Pritchard *Term Expires*
Head, Department of Physical Education and Athletics
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, Mass. 01609 Jan. 1972

District 2 Vice-President—Ernest C. Casale Jan. 1973
Director of Athletics
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

District 3 Vice-President—H. Boyd McWhorter Jan. 1972
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30601

District 4 Vice-President—John A. Fuzak Jan. 1973
Associate Dean and Director, School for Advanced Studies,
College of Education
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823

District 5 Vice-President—David Swank Jan. 1972
Professor of Law and Legal Counsel
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73069

District 6 Vice-President—Alan J. Chapman Jan. 1973
Professor of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Box 1892, Rice University, Houston, Texas 77001

1971 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

The Council (Continued)

- District 7 Vice-President*—Louis A. MyersJan. 1972
Professor of Accounting, College of Business and
Public Administration
University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721
- District 8 Vice-President*—George F. IlgJan. 1973
Assistant Dean, School of Agricultural Sciences
Fresno State College, Fresno, California 93710
- Vice-President-at-Large*—Wilford H. KetzJan. 1972
Director of Institutional Studies
Union College, Schenectady, New York 12308
- Member-at-Large*—Frank R. CarverJan. 1972
Secretary to Board of Trustees
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
- Member-at-Large*—Harry M. CrossJan. 1974
Professor of Law
University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98105
- Member-at-Large*—J. William DavisJan. 1974
Professor of Government
Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409
- Member-at-Large*—Howard C. GentryJan. 1974
Director of Athletics
Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tenn. 37203
- Member-at-Large*—Richard P. KoenigJan. 1972
Vice-President for Public and Alumni Affairs
Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana 46383
- Member-at-Large*—Dwight T. ReedJan. 1972
Director of Athletics
Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
- Member-at-Large*—Adolph W. SamborskiJan. 1973
Commissioner, Yankee Conference
Box 315, Seabury Road, York, Maine 03909

1971 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

Executive Committee

The NCAA president, vice-president-at-large and secretary-treasurer shall be ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The remaining seven members of the Committee are elected by the Council for a period of one year. At least one new member shall be elected each year. Date of first election is shown in parentheses.

- Stan Bates (Jan. 1970)
Commissioner, Western Athletic Conference
1515 Cleveland Place, Denver, Colorado 80202
- A. M. Coleman (Jan. 1971)
Commissioner, Southeastern Conference
1214 Central Bank Bldg., Birmingham, Alabama 35233
- Wayne Duke (April 1969)
Commissioner, Big Ten Conference
505 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60611
- William J. Flynn (Jan. 1971)
Director of Athletics
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167
- Marcus L. Plant (Jan. 1969)
Professor of Law, 332 Hutchins Hall
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
- Polk F. Robison (Jan. 1970)
Athletic Administrator of Finance and Development
Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409
- Francis E. Smiley (Jan. 1967)
Dean of Students
Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colorado 80401

Executive Office

- Walter Byers, *Executive Director*
Arthur J. Bergstrom, *Controller*
Warren S. Brown, *Assistant Executive Director*
Thomas C. Hansen, *Assistant Executive Director*
Charles M. Nelnas, *Assistant Executive Director*
- Gene Duffy, *Director of Events*
Marjorie Fieber, *Business Manager*
Grayle W. Howlett, *Promotion Director*
Ralph McFillen, *Executive Assistant*
Bruce E. Skinner, *NCAA News Editor*
Louis J. Spry, *Director of Research*
Fannie Vaughan, *Administrative Assistant*
James H. Wilkinson, *Director of Sports Development*
- THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
Midland Building, 1221 Baltimore Avenue
Kansas City, Missouri 64105
Area Code 816; Phone 474-4600

1971 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

Service Bureau

Larry Klein, *Director*
Jack Waters, *Assistant Director*
Jim Van Valkenburg, *Assistant Director*
Steve Boda, *Research*
Chris Erles, *Compilations*
Jerry Klein, *Compilations*
Ron Schwartz, *News Film*

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE SPORTS SERVICES
Box 757, Grand Central Station
New York, New York 10017
Area Code 212; Phone 685-9622

The Service Bureau collects, compiles and distributes the official statistics of college football, basketball and baseball and performs other services commonly associated with a sports information and promotional agency.

Publishing Service

Homer F. Cooke, Jr., *Director*
Marie Montana, *Assistant Director*
Jonathan Clark, *Publications Editor*
Steve Guss, *General Editor*
Geraldine Paul, *Circulation Manager*

COLLEGE ATHLETICS PUBLISHING SERVICE
349 East Thomas Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
Area Code 602; Phone 264-5656

The Service publishes the official guides, rule books and scorebooks of the Association

Film Service

Richard S. Snider, *Director*
NCAA OFFICIAL FILMS
5401 Westbard Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20016
Area Code 202; Phone 652-1885

The Service produces and maintains the official films of the Association

SIXTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION DELEGATES AND VISITORS

Active Member Institutions

District One

American International College: Bob Burke
Amherst College: J. Tracy Mehr
Bates College: Lloyd H. Lux
Bentley College: Elwood N. Shields
Boston College: William J. Flynn
Boston State College: James P. Sullivan
Boston University: Warren Schmakel
Bowdoin College: Daniel Stuckey
Brandeis University: Nicholas Rodis
Bridgeport, University of: Fran Poisson
Bridgewater State College: Edward C. Swenson
Brown University: John M. Jeffernan
Clark University: Russ Granger
Colby College: John W. Winkin
Connecticut, University of: John L. Toner, Paul N. Taylor
Dartmouth College: Seaver Peters, Alden H. Burnham
Fairfield University: George R. Bisacca
Hartford, University of: Roger A. Wickman
Harvard University: Baaron B. Pittenger, Eric Cutler, Adolph W. Samborski
Holy Cross College: Vincent G. Dougherty
Lowell Technological Institute: W. W. Yarnall
Maine, University of: Harold S. Westerman
Massachusetts, University of: Warren P. McGuirk, Robert W. O'Connell
Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Ross H. Smith
New Hampshire, University of: Andrew Mooradian
Nichols College: Hal Chalmers
North Adams State College: Joseph Zavattaro
Northeastern University: Herbert W. Gallagher, Joseph P. Zabilski
Plymouth State College: Paul E. Arold
Providence College: Aloysius B. Begley
Rhode Island, University of: Maurice Zarchen
Rhode Island College: William M. Baird
Salem State College: Richard L. Schneider
Southern Connecticut State College: Eugene Shelar, Jess L. Dow
Springfield College: Edward S. Steltz
Tufts University: Eugene S. Ashton, Harry Arlanson
U. S. Coast Guard Academy: Otto Graham
Vermont, University of: J. Edward Donnelly, Denis E. Lambert
Wesleyan University: Norman J. Daniels, Donald M. Russell
Westfield State College: F. Paul Bogan, John Kurty
Williams College: Robert Peck, Frank R. Thoms, Jr.
Windham College: Donald H. Amaral

Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Robert W. Pritchard
Worcester State College: Robert A. Devlin
Yale University: James G. Holgate, DeLaney Kiphuth

District Two

Adelphi University: James L. Bedell
Albright College: Eugene L. Shirk
Alfred University: Alex Yunevich
American University: William Ahlstrom, Anthony C. Morella, Robert H. Frailey
Brooklyn College: Charles Tobey
Bucknell University: Robert A. Latour
California State College: Paul E. Ross
Cheyney State College: Edwin W. Lawrence
City College of New York: Ray Klivecka, Robert M. Behrman
Clarion State College: Frank Lignelli
Clarkson College of Technology: John J. Hantz
Colgate University: Harold W. Lahar
Columbia University: Kenneth G. Germann
Cornell University: Robert J. Kane, Clayton W. Chapman
Delaware, University of: David M. Nelson, Raymond B. Duncan
Delaware State College: James H. Williams
Delaware Valley College: Ned A. Linta
Dickinson College: David B. Eavenson
Drexel University: John Semanik
East Stroudsburg State College: John R. Eiler
Elizabethtown College: John M. Tulley
Fairleigh Dickinson University (Madison): Robert T. Shields
Fairleigh Dickinson University (Teaneck): Harvey D. Woods, George Manfredi
Franklin and Marshall College: Ronald F. Gray
Gannon College: Howard Elwell
Gettysburg College: Eugene M. Haas
Glassboro State College: Maurice G. Verbeke, D. Michael Briglia
Hamilton College: Mox A. Weber
Hampton Institute: Herman N. Neilson
Haverford College: Dana W. Swan
Herbert H. Lehman College: Michael M. Fleischer
Hofstra University: Philip R. Theibert
Howard University: Samuel E. Barnes, Leo F. Miles
Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Herman L. Sledzik
Ithaca College: Carlton Wood
Juniata College: Walter Nadzak, Jr.
Lafayette College: Olav B. Kollevoll
LaSalle College: Robert J. Courtney, John J. Conboy
Lehigh University: William B. Leckonby, Craig Anderson
LeMoyne College: Thomas J. Niland, Jr.
Long Island University: Roy Rubin
Lycoming College: David G. Busey
Maryland, University of: Vernon E. McCain
Millersville State College: Lawrence A. McDermott
Montclair State College: William P. Dioguardi
Morgan State College: Robert A. Smith, Talmadge L. Hill, Thomas P. Fraser, Embra C. Bowie

Muhlenberg College: Raymond J. Whispell
New York, State University of, Buffalo: Jim Peelle, Robert Deming, James Hansen
New York, State University of, Albany: Joe Garcia, John R. Tibbetts
New York, State University of, Buffalo: George M. MacDonald, Howard A. Meyers
New York, State University College, Cortland: Francis J. Woods
New York, State University College, Geneseo: Robert F. Riedel
New York, State University College, New Paltz: Joseph A. Owens
New York, State University College, Oswego: Walter J. Nitardy
New York, State University College, Plattsburgh: Joseph C. Jastrab
New York University: Ben L. Carnevale, Hugo M. Castello
PMC Colleges: George A. Hansell
Pace College: Peter X. Finnerty
Pennsylvania, University of: Fred A. Shabel
Pennsylvania State University: Robert J. Scannell, Edward M. Czekaj, T. Sherman Stanford, James I. Tarman, Ernest B. McCoy, John J. Coyle
Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Harry Pure
Pittsburgh, University of (Johnstown): Ed Sherlock
Pittsburgh, University of (Pittsburgh): Paul H. Masoner, Frank Carver, Casimir J. Myslinski, Walt Cummins
C. W. Post College: William T. Lai
Princeton University: R. Kenneth Fairman
Puerto Rico, University of: Victor M. Perez
Queens College: Robert J. Tierney
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Warren C. Lutes, Edward Jucker
Rider College: Francis Pittaro
Rochester, University of: Donald C. Smith
Rutgers University: Albert W. Twitchell, Frederick E. Gruninger
Saint Francis College: Roger Nagle
Saint John's University: Walter T. McLaughlin
Saint Lawrence University: Thomas A. Cartmill
Scranton, University of: David R. Ocorr
Seton Hall University: Richard J. Regan, John J. Horgan
Slippery Rock State College: William C. Meise, Bradley F. Keith
Syracuse University: Ronald J. Oyer, James H. Decker
Temple University: Ernest C. Casale
Thiel College: James L. McCullough
Union College: Bill Ketz, George W. Flood
U. S. Merchant Marine Academy: James W. Liebertz
U. S. Military Academy: Gus Dielens
U. S. Naval Academy: J. O. Coppedge
Ursinus College: Everett M. Bailey
Villanova University: Arthur L. Mahan
West Chester State College: Robert W. Reese
West Virginia University: Robert N. Brown, Ruel E. Foster

District Three

Alabama, University of: Sam D. Bailey, Jefferson J. Coleman, Willard F. Gray
Alabama State University: C. Johnson Dunn
Appalachian State University: James F. Jones
Auburn University: Charles F. Simmons

Austin Peay State University: David B. Aaron, Leon Bibb
 Bellarmine College: Hilary H. Gottbrath
 Catholic University: J. Brian McCall
 Citadel, The: Edward L. Teague, Jr., David S. McAlister
 Clemson University: R. R. Ritchie, H. C. McLellan, Jr., Kenneth N. Vickery
 Davidson College: Tom Scott
 Duke University: Allan Kornberg, Edward M. Cameron, Carl James
 East Carolina University: Clarence Stasavich
 East Tennessee State University: Solon Gentry
 Eastern Kentucky University: Glenn E. Presnell
 Emory University: Clyde Partin
 Florida, University of: Ray Graves, Percy Beard, Mandell Glicksberg
 Florida State University: Vaughn H. Mancha, J. Stanley Marshall
 Furman University: J. Lyles Alley
 Gallaudet College: Peter R. Wisher
 George Washington University: Robert K. Faris, Edward A. Caress
 Georgia, University of: H. Boyd McWhorter, Joel Eaves
 Georgia Institute of Technology: Jesse W. Mason, John McKenna
 Georgia Southern College: J. I. Clements, Jr.
 Johns Hopkins University: Marshall S. Turner, Jr.
 Kentucky, University of: Harry C. Lancaster, W. L. Matthews, Jr.
 Kentucky State College: Henry E. Cheaney, William Exum
 Kentucky Wesleyan College: J. William Douglas
 Louisiana Technological University: Harold J. Smolinski
 Louisiana State University: Jack Gilmore, Carl Maddox
 Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: E. Richard Watts, Jr.
 Maryland, University of: James H. Kehoe, Jr., John E. Faber
 McNeese State University: Frank M. Rolufs
 Memphis State University: Ruffner P. Murray, Billy J. Murphy
 Miami, University of: Charles M. Capps
 Middle Tennessee State University: Charles M. Murphy
 Mississippi, University of: T. A. Bickerstaff, John R. Holley, Porter L. Fortune
 Mississippi State University: Charles N. Shira, J. Kenneth Jones
 Nicholls State University: Raymond D. Didier
 North Carolina, University of (Chapel Hill): E. M. Hedgpeth, Homer C. Rice
 North Carolina, University of (Wilmington): William J. Brooks
 North Carolina A & T State University: Albert E. Smith, Artis P. Graves
 North Carolina Central University: James W. Younge
 North Carolina State University: Frank Weedon, Willis R. Casey, Ralph Fadum
 Northeast Louisiana University: Marcus B. Mapp
 Richmond, University of: B. Frank Jones
 Rollins College: Joseph Justice
 South, University of the: Walter D. Bryant
 South Alabama, University of: Melvin A. Lucas
 South Carolina, University of: John C. Guilds, Weems O. Baskin, Jr.
 South Florida, University of: Richard T. Bowers
 Southeastern Louisiana University: Ralph W. Wilson
 Southern Mississippi, University of: B. Reed Green, J. Lloyd Milam

Southwestern College: William R. Maybry
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Charles E. Cosper, A. G. Urban
 Stillman College: Jesse Hosey
 Tennessee, University of: G. Robert Woodruff, Earl M. Ramer
 Tennessee State University: John M. Mallette, Howard C. Gentry
 Tennessee Technological University: R. Hooper Eblen
 Tougaloo College: James C. Coleman
 Towson State College: Thomas Minehardt
 Tulane University: Hugh F. Rankin, Rix N. Yard, Bill Curl, Harvey Jessup
 Tuskegee Institute: H. Frank Leftwich, Jr.
 Vanderbilt University: Jess C. Neely, Rob Roy Purdy
 Virginia, University of: D. Alan Williams, Eugene F. Corrigan
 Virginia Military Institute: Tom Joynes, John G. Barrett
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: Jerry Claibourne, Wilson B. Bell
 Virginia State College: Thomas Verdell
 Wake Forest University: John W. Sawyer, Jesse A. Haddock, Gene E. Hooks
 Washington and Lee University: Dick Miller, William D. McHenry
 William and Mary, College of: H. Lester Hooker, Jr.

District Four

Akron, University of: Gordon K. Larson
 Ashland College: George H. Donges, Robert Wendling, Fred Martinelli
 Ball State University: John E. Reno, Philip E. Ballou, Raymond A. Louthen
 Bowling Green State University: Bob Bell, Kenneth H. McFall, Doyt L. Perry
 Butler University: Tom Warner
 Capital University: William F. Bernlohr
 Central Michigan University: Terrence J. Carey, Bill Theunissen
 Chicago, University of: Walter L. Hass
 Dayton, University of: Harry C. Baujan, Jim Hoover, Thomas J. Frericks
 Denison University: Roy G. Seils
 DePauw University: James C. Loveless
 Detroit, University of: Robert J. Calihan
 Eastern Illinois University: Tom Katsimpalis, Peter R. Moody
 Hope College: Gordon M. Brewer
 Illinois, University of, Chicago Circle: Edward L. Deam, Walter G. Versen
 Illinois, University of, Urbana: Henry S. Stillwell, E. Eugene Vance
 Illinois State University: Milton E. Weisbecker, Warren S. Perry
 Indiana University: Chris C. Dal Sasso, James W. Orwig, Edwin H. Cady
 Indiana State University: Samuel W. Suttle, Gordon H. Chalmers
 Iowa, University of: Robert F. Ray, Chalmers W. Elliott
 Kalamazoo College: Rolla L. Anderson
 Kent State University: Walton D. Clarke, Mike Lude
 MacMurray College: Dave Berst
 Mankato State: James R. Otto
 Marshall University: Edward M. Starling, Harold L. Willey

Miami University: Richard G. Shrider, Fred Cottrell
 Michigan, University of: Donald B. Canham, David H. Strack, Marcus L. Plant
 Michigan State University: Clarence L. Munn
 Michigan Technological University: Kenzie R. Johnson
 Minnesota, University of (Duluth): Ralph A. Romano
 Minnesota, University of (Minneapolis): Marshall W. Ryman, Max O. Schultze
 Mount Union College: William Dessecker
 Muskingum College: Edgar A. Sherman
 Northern Illinois University: Nye Labaw, Robert J. Brigham, Clyde C. Walton
 Northern Michigan University: Henry S. Heimonen
 Northwestern University: William H. Dye, Waldo A. Fisher, Leon A. Bosch
 Notre Dame, University of: Michael A. DeCicco, Edward W. Krause, John J. Stephens
 Oberlin College: William Grice
 Ohio State University: J. Edward Weaver, Hugh Hindman, Wilbur E. Snypp, James McCoy
 Ohio University: Fred Picard, William D. Rohr
 Ohio Wesleyan University: Robert M. Strimer
 Otterbein College: Robert Agler
 Purdue University Calumet Campus: Robert C. Hayes, Gordon Rosenau
 Purdue University: Roy L. Whistler, Ray Eddy
 Saint Cloud State College: Don Watkins, Rod Anfenson, Robert A. Peterson
 Saint Joseph's College: Richard F. Scharf
 Saint Olaf College: Axel C. Bundgaard
 Southern Illinois University (Carbondale): Bill Brown, Donald N. Boydston
 Southern Illinois University (Edwardsville): E. M. Carpenter, Harry J. Gallatin
 Toledo, University of: Arthur G. Francis, Edwin L. Saxer
 Valparaiso University: Emory G. Bauer, Richard Koenig
 Wayne State University: Vernon K. Gale, James Tennant
 Western Illinois University: Frank D. Sorenson, Gil Peterson
 Western Michigan University: Joseph T. Hoy, Leo C. Vanderbeek
 Wheaton College: Donald C. Boardman, Harvey C. Chrouser
 Wisconsin, University of: Elroy L. Hirsch, William H. Aspinwall, George H. Young
 Wisconsin, University of (Milwaukee): Mike Conger
 Wittenberg University: William M. Edwards
 Xavier University: Jack Cherry, James J. McCafferty
 Youngstown State University: Willard L. Webster

District Five

Augustana College: A. L. Sponberg
 Bradley University: Orville Nothdurft, Charles K. Orsborn
 Central Missouri State College: Floyd Walker
 Cincinnati, University of: George D. Smith, Bill Schwarberg
 Coe College: Glenn J. Drahn

Colorado, University of: William H. Baughn, Edwin B. Crowder, Fred Casotti
 Cornell College: William Deskin
 Creighton University: Larry Cochell
 Drake University: Robert D. Karnes
 Iowa State University: Harry G. Burrell, Maurice W. Soult, G. Clayton Stapleton
 Kansas, University of: Charles H. Oldfather, Wade R. Stinson
 Kansas State University: C. Clyde Jones, Ernie D. Barrett
 Lincoln University: Dwight T. Reed
 Louisville, University of: Carl E. Abner, Bernard L. Hickman
 Midland Lutheran College: Max N. Kitzelman
 Missouri, University of, Columbia: Arthur W. Nebel
 Missouri, University of, Saint Louis: Lawrence D. Friedman
 Nebraska, University of: James C. Pittenger, Don Bryant, John R. Davis
 North Dakota, University of: Leonard R. Marti
 North Texas State University: William A. Miller, Rod Rust
 Northeast Missouri State College: James J. Dougherty, John D. Black
 Northern Iowa, University of: Stan Sheriff
 Oklahoma, University of: Gomer T. Jones, David Swank
 Oklahoma State University: Don Cooper, Harvey Griffin, Ray E. Chapel
 Parsons College: Spencer E. Martin, John Wahrer
 Saint Louis University: Larry K. Albus, Jerome J. Marchetti
 South Dakota, University of: John O. Roning
 South Dakota State University: Stanley J. Marshall
 Southwest Missouri State College: Aldo A. Sebben
 Tulsa, University of: John P. Dratz
 Wichita State University: Robert M. Holmer

District Six

Abilene Christian College: Garvin Beauchamp
 Alcorn A & M College: Ernest A. Boykins, Marino H. Casem
 Arkansas, University of: J. H. Barnhill, John E. Kane, George R. Cole
 Arkansas A M & N College: Vannette W. Johnson
 Arkansas State University: Don S. Floyd, Sammy R. Gennuso
 Baylor University: Bill Henderson, Edwin P. Horner
 Bishop College: Dwight A. Fisher
 Centenary College: Wayne Hanson, Orvis U. Sigler
 Grambling College: Douglas T. Porter
 Hardin-Simmons University: Glen Whitis
 Houston, University of: Harry H. Fouke, Frank Stovall, Martin Wright
 Houston Baptist College: Ed S. Billings
 Lamar State College of Technology: James B. Higgins
 Pan American College: James A. Brooks, John W. Hook
 Prairie View A & M College: Alexander Durley
 Rice University: Alan J. Chapman
 Southern Methodist University: Jim Brock, Hayden Fry, E. D. Mouzon, Jr., Harold Jeskey
 Southern University: Ulysses S. Jones, Sr., Horace W. Moody, Alva Tabor
 Texas, University of (Arlington): John D. Boon, Claude R. Gilstrap

Texas, University of (Austin): J. Neils Thompson, Jones Ramsey, Charles Wright
 Texas A & M University: Charles H. Samson, Jr., Earl D. Bennett, Ogburn D. Butler
 Texas Christian University: Abe Martin, Ken Herrick
 Texas Southern University: David D. Rains
 Texas Technological University: Polk Robison, Richard B. Amandes, J. William Davis, J. T. King
 Trinity University: Jess G. Carnes
 West Texas State University: L. Jack Edmondson, Frank Kimbrough, Joseph E. Kerbel

District Seven

Arizona, University of: Frank W. Soltys, Marion R. Clausen, Louis A. Myers
 Arizona State University: Clyde B. Smith, Alfred Thomas, Jr.
 Boise State College: V. Dale Blickenstaff, Lyle H. Smith
 Brigham Young University: Milton F. Hartvigsen, Floyd R. Taylor, Glen Tuckett
 Colorado School of Mines: Francis Smiley, Fritz S. Brennecke
 Colorado State University: Urban Bowman, Perry C. Moore, Harry E. Troxell
 Denver, University of: E. Hoyt Brawner
 Idaho, University of: Edward T. Knecht, Roland O. Byers
 Idaho State University: Darold H. Chambers, Milton W. Holt
 Montana, University of: Walter C. Schwank, Earl C. Lory
 Montana State University: Harry G. Cockrum, Tom Parac
 New Mexico, University of: Joe E. Martinez, Lavon McDonald, Pete McDavid
 New Mexico State University: Keith Colson, Carl R. Hall
 Northern Arizona University: Lyle L. Mullens, Norman B. Johansen
 Northern Colorado, University of: Don Chaloupka, Joe Lindahl
 Southern Colorado State College: Houston C. Simms
 Texas, University of: Richard W. Burns, George C. McCarty
 U. S. Air Force Academy: Frank E. Merritt, Philip J. Erdle
 Utah, University of: Robert W. Swenson, James R. Jack
 Utah State University: Norman B. Jones, Frank R. Williams
 Weber State College: Milton C. Mecham, Dale L. Gardner
 Wyoming, University of: Joseph Geraud, Glenn J. Jacoby

District Eight

California, University of, Berkeley: Robley C. Williams, Paul W. Brechler
 California, University of, Davis: William L. Lakie, Hubert Heitman
 California, University of, Los Angeles: Thomas L. Jacobs, J. D. Morgan, Robert A. Fischer
 California, University of, Santa Barbara: A. Edward Swartz
 California State College, Hayward: James L. Comer
 California State College, Long Beach: Fred L. Miller
 California State College, Los Angeles: Homer T. Beatty
 California State Polytechnic College, Pomona: Vernon L. Gregory, Don Warhurst
 California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo: R. R. Harper
 Chico State College: Rex R. Grossart

Fresno State College: Cecil N. Coleman, George F. Ilg
 Hawaii, University of: Paul Durham
 Nevada, University of: Michael Drakulich, Dallas W. Norton
 Nevada, University of, Reno: Richard T. Trachok
 Oregon, University of: Norv Ritchey, Wendell M. Basye
 Oregon State University: James G. Barratt, Kline R. Swygard
 Pacific, University of the: Edward S. Betz, Cedric W. Dempsey
 Pepperdine College: Walter R. Glass
 Pomona College: Edward W. Malan
 Portland State University: Jesse L. Gilmore, J. Neil Stahley
 Redlands, University of: Ted C. Runner, Frank Serrao, Paul Taylor
 Saint Mary's College: Donald J. McKillip
 San Diego State College: Ken Karr, Gene Bourdet
 San Francisco, University of: Peter P. Peletta
 San Jose State College: Robert T. Bronzan
 Santa Clara, University of: George P. Malley
 Southern California, University of: Jesse T. Hill, Tom Nickell, Forrest F. Twogood, E. John Larsen
 Stanford University: Robert G. Young, John W. Harbaugh
 Washington, University of: Joseph L. Kearney, Harry M. Cross
 Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Stan Bates

Allied Members

Atlantic Coast Conference: Norvall Neve, Marvin A. Francis, R. R. Ritchie
 Big Eight Conference: Wayne Duke, John D. Waldorf
 Big Sky Athletic Conference: Jack Friel
 Big Ten Conference: John D. Dewey, William R. Reed
 California Collegiate Athletic Association: V. L. Gregory
 Central Collegiate Conference: Robert D. Karnes
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Clarence E. Gaines
 Eastern College Athletic Conference: George L. Shiebler, Robert S. Whitelaw
 Far Western Conference: Herbert Heitman
 Gulf States Conference: Stanley Galloway
 Indiana Collegiate Conference: John J. Hinga
 Ivy Basketball League: Clayton W. Chapman
 Maine Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Stuart P. Haskell, Jr.
 Mid-American Conference: Robert C. James
 Middle Atlantic States Conference: Marshall S. Turner, Jr.
 Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: William Deskin
 Midwestern Conference: Jack McClelland
 Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Roy F. Brown
 Missouri Valley Conference: DeWitt T. Weaver
 New England College Athletic Conference: Herbert W. Gallagher
 North Central Conference: Richard G. Koppenhaver
 Ohio Athletic Conference: Albert N. Smith
 Ohio Valley Conference: Arthur L. Guepe
 Pacific Coast Athletic Association: Cameron S. Deeds
 Pacific-8 Conference: Thomas J. Hamilton
 Southeastern Conference: Cliff Harper, Elmore Hudgins, A. M. Coleman
 Southern Conference: Lloyd P. Jordan

Southwest Athletic Conference: Bill Morgan, Wilbur Evans, Howard Grubbs, Cliff Speegle
 Southwestern Athletic Conference: C. D. Henry
 West Coast Athletic Conference: Wilfred H. Crowley, Walter J. Hawkins
 Western Athletic Conference: Wiles Hallock
 Yankee Conference: J. O. Christian

Associate Members

Allen University: Thomas B. Nelson
 Baptist College: W. Howard Bagwell
 Bowie State College: A. C. Jordan
 Oral Roberts University: Robert Brooks
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Dean Austin

Affiliated Members

National Athletic Trainers Association: Pinky Newell
 National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: William H. Geyer, Jr.

Visitors

Bulova Watch Company: Russ Geldmacher
 C. D. Chesley Company: Castleman D. Chesley
 Cotton Bowl Athletic Association: Field Scovell
 Eastern Montana College: Frank J. Spechalske
 Football Publications: Charlie Thorp
 Gator Bowl: L. C. Ringhaver, George R. Olsen
 Grossmont College: Bob Rump
 Hughes Sports Network: H. B. Lee
 Louisiana Superdome: Dave Dixon, Joey Morgan
 Memphis Memorial Stadium: T. J. Foley, Jr.
 Memphis Park Commission: H. S. Lewis
 NCAA Films: Richard S. Snider
 National Association of College Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary
 National Directory of College Athletics: Ray Franks
 National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Chester J. LaRoche, Robert A. Hall
 Pasadena Bowl: Bob Cheney, Dick Heimann, Gary Dorn
 President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports: C. Carson Conrad
 Spencer Marketing Services: John F. Geis, Al Lubrano
 Sugar Bowl: Joe Katz, Irwin Poche, Monk Simons, Charles Zatarain, A. B. Nicholas
 Sun Bowl: Harrison D. Kohl
 Tampa Sports Authority: Frank M. Lorenzo
 Tampa, University of: Sam M. Bailey
 Tel Ra Productions: W. Wallace Orr
 Tournament of Roses: Stanley Hahn, A. Lewis Shingler, Raymond Dorn, William N. Nicholas
 U. S. Gymnastics Federation: Frank L. Bare
 West Coast Sports Association: Red Mitchum, James W. Kynes, Thomas C. MacDonald, Jr.
 Wisconsin State University Conference: Fred Jacoby

Working News Media

Arizona Star: Abe Chanin
 Associated Press: Herschel Nissenson, Max Skelton
 Austin American Statesman: Dick Collins
 Houston Chronicle: Charles Carder, Hal Lundgren, Dick Peebles
 Houston Forward Times: Artice Vaughan
 Houston Post: Jack Agness, Jack Gallagher, Clark Nealon
 Kansas City Star: Bill Sims
 Knoxville News Sentinel: Tom Siler
 Nashville Banner: Fred Russell
 Newark News: Mel Woody
 New York Times: Gordon White
 Oklahoman: Volney Meece
 Pasadena Independent Star News: Joe Hendrickson
 Salt Lake City Tribune: John Mooney
 Tucson Citizen: Carl Porter
 United Press International: John Griffin, Darrel Mack
 Waco Tribune: Dave Campbell

OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

Monday, January 11, 1971

The opening session of the Sixty-Fifth Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened in Ballroom A of the Astroworld Hotel, Houston, Texas, at 10:10 a.m., Harry M. Cross, professor of law, University of Washington, and President of the Association, presiding.

1. OPENING REMARKS

President Cross: Those of you who have registered and have received the Convention Program have realized that it is considerably larger than usual. If you have had a chance to look at it you will discover that the pink pages in the back are the reprint of the current 1970-71 Manual. The green pages in the center are the Revised Constitution, Bylaws and Interpretations adopted by the Council in August under the authority of the resolution adopted last year. The yellow pages contain the proposed legislation which, as approved, will become active August 1, next, as will the Revised Constitution and Bylaws except as the Convention determines to make a change effective immediately.

On page 23, in Amendment No. 17, there was an inadvertent omission. Before the bold-faced proposed additions or amendments, the present language, "or Association-approved conference or institutional tables" was omitted. That was inadvertent and it should, of course, be read as being there.

On page 30, Proposal No. 32, has been publicized in the NCAA News, but it was not in the Official Notice you received earlier. It was concluded that it should be brought to the Convention as the more important interpretations customarily are.

There are some corrections in the Revised Constitution and Bylaws which was sent to you on September 15 to which I wish to call your attention.

On page 7, Constitution 1-(3)-(f), in the fifth line, where it reads "school unless he has been in residence a minimum of one academic term," there has been added there the words, "a minimum of" as a matter of editorial refinement.

On page 77, there was an inadvertent carry-over reference to 'B' average in the O.I. 402, which should be 2.500.

On page 85, O.I. 412, should read, in part, as follows:

"... or on a test available to prospective students generally which is administered on the college or university campus under the authority of the SAT or ACT service."

You will recall, we purposely eliminated the possibility of the local SAT or ACT test.

On page 101, Bylaw 7-(2)-(f)-(1), the original second sentence in that paragraph was improperly omitted. That is: "At least four of the eleven members shall be elected from the College Division members

and at least four elected from the University Division members."

These are the only editorial changes or omissions that were found in the most recent attempt to make sure it is all in proper form.

2. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

William J. Flynn (Boston College): Mr. President and Gentlemen: The Constitution provides that the Secretary-Treasurer shall submit to this Annual Convention a report of all receipts and disbursements during the preceding fiscal year which ended August 31. Also, I will provide information on the status of the Association's membership.

Francis A. Wright and Company, Kansas City, Missouri, has performed an audit of the Association's financial status for the period beginning September 1, 1969, and terminating August 31, 1970. This report will be found on pages 110-119 of the 1969-70 Annual Reports, a copy of which is available to each delegate at the registration desk. The financial examination was supplemented by audit reports furnished by certified public accountants in New York City and Phoenix, these organizations reviewing the financial operations of the National Collegiate Sports Services and the College Athletics Publishing Service, respectively.

For the 1969-70 year, the NCAA's total assets amounted to \$1,397,618.57 as compared to \$1,469,760.22 for 1968-69, a difference of \$72,142. The decrease in assets can be attributed to: (1) a decrease in the value of investments; (2) a decrease in cash on hand, and (3) the sale of securities at losses. The decrease in the value of investments and sale of securities at losses are self-explanatory and the decrease in cash on hand resulted from the purchase of land for the proposed building in the amount of \$210,000.

The general income for the 1969-70 year was \$695,080.58 as against \$741,699.88 in 1968-69, a decrease of \$46,619.30. General operating expenses amounted to \$611,191.92 as against \$501,940.78 in 1968-69. Smaller income came about primarily as a result of decreases in revenue from the film service and income from investments. Expenses increased as a result of general inflationary pressures, increase in staff in the executive office and additional meetings. You would be interested to know that the Association's executive office was responsible for handling in excess of \$2,500,000 in 1969-70.

Reference is made to the Association's two reserves, Funded Cash and Investment Trust. The Funded Cash is covered in full by cash or immediately marketable securities and currently amounts to \$65,010. The Investment Trust, formerly in two separate accounts, has been consolidated and presently amounts to \$409,359.19. In 1968-69, the Investment Trust totaled \$459,978.71. The decrease of \$50,619.52 can be attributed to the depressed condition of the stock market.

During 1969-70, the Association purchased approximately 3.4 acres of land in Mission, Kansas. This land will be the site of the NCAA's proposed building now in the planning stage. The purchase was made on a cash basis and is indicated by the investment in the National Collegiate Realty Corporation under "Other Assets."

I am pleased to report that the Association's membership continues to grow and now totals 747 members, an increase of 3.8 per cent over 1969. This 3.8 per cent is the largest increase since 1957. There are 645

active members, 44 allied members, 32 associate members and 26 affiliated members.

New members which joined during the past year are as follows:

ACTIVE

District 1

Nasson College, Springvale, Maine
Sacred Heart University, Bridgeport, Connecticut

District 2

Bethany College, Bethany, West Virginia
Elmira College, Elmira, New York
New York Institute of Technology, Long Island, New York
Newark State College, Union, New Jersey
New York State University of Stony Brook, New York
Paterson State College, Wayne, New Jersey

District 3

Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina
Biscayne College, Miami, Florida
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical Institute, Daytona Beach, Florida
Emory and Henry College, Emory, Virginia
Miles College, Birmingham, Alabama
Mississippi Valley State College, Itta Bena, Mississippi
University of North Carolina, Charlotte

District 4

Lake Superior State College, Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan

District 5

University of Missouri, St. Louis
Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa
Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa

District 6

University of Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi, Texas

District 8

Alaska Methodist University, Anchorage, Alaska
California State College, Dominguez Hills, California
Southern Oregon College, Ashland, Oregon

ASSOCIATE

University of Alabama, Birmingham
Indiana Northern University, University Park, Indiana
Lindenwood Colleges, St. Charles, Missouri
Luther Rice College, Alexandria, Virginia
New Hampshire College, Manchester, New Hampshire
Northrop Institute of Technology, Inglewood, California

ALLIED

Conference of Midwestern Universities
Eastern Intercollegiate Gymnastic League
Eastern Intercollegiate Wrestling Association
Southern Intercollegiate Gymnastic League

AFFILIATED

National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame
National Gymnastics Judges Association

Mr. President, this concludes the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, including the printed audit, and I move that it be received.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and approved.]

3. EXPLANATION OF VOTING PROCEDURES

President Cross: On the back of your registration badge you will find a brief review of the voting procedure. It will be necessary for everyone to wear a registration badge to vote and be admitted to the business session.

To expedite matters, the Chair will call for a voice vote to indicate the action of the Convention. If the Chair is in doubt, he will call for a standing vote. After the Voting Committee has counted the vote, if the result is close, the Chair will authorize a ballot vote. A request for a roll call vote must be approved by the majority of those in attendance and voting.

Each active member and each allied member is entitled to one vote. Member institutions may have more than one representative present, but the voting delegate has a white badge and the alternate has a blue badge. If the voting delegate is present he shall cast the vote. In his absence the alternate is entitled to vote. Visitors have pink badges and members of the press have goldenrod badges.

As you recall, Constitutional amendments require two-thirds of those present and voting. That also applies to an official interpretation of the Constitution. Bylaws amendments require a simple majority of those present and voting and the official interpretations of the Bylaws a simple majority. If it becomes necessary to call for a ballot vote, the Chair will indicate which ballot is to be used. Each voting delegate has been given a packet of ballots. The red ballot and the red portion of the ballot will be used for an affirmative vote, and the purple for a negative vote. On a ballot vote the authorized representative will cast the ballot, and for this purpose the ballots have been issued to the voting delegates as indicated by the member institution or conference. If he is not present, the ballot may be cast by the alternate delegate. So if the voting delegate leaves the room or is unable to attend the session, he should give the ballots to his alternate.

There is provision in both the Constitution and the Bylaws for amending. The basic provision is a matter of protection for all member institutions, and that is that adequate notice of proposed amendment must be given in order to be considered at this Convention. The amendment is transmitted in writing by the body proposing it to the executive office. It is then distributed in the Official Notice.

A proposed amendment to the Constitution may be amended here at the Convention by a majority vote of the members present and voting, provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the constitutional provision to the amendment.

The proposed amendment may be amended within the scope of the Notice that was distributed, but it may not be changed to enlarge it.

Amendments to proposed amendments must be submitted in writing to the Secretary prior to 1:00 p.m. tomorrow; that is, the day preceding the final business session of the Convention. If anyone desires to amend a previously circulated amendment it should be delivered to Mr. Flynn or to the headquarters suite prior to one tomorrow.

As you recall, we adopted a resolution in 1970 in accordance with Article 6, Section 3, of the Constitution, which empowered the Council to adopt by two-thirds vote a recodified, reorganized and revised

Constitution and Bylaws. The revised document as adopted was circularized to all members last September, and it is this, as I said earlier, which is subject to amendment at this Convention.

For approximately two years the Association's Long Range Planning Committee has discussed the issue of divided voting at the Annual Convention based on institutional competitive designation. I am sure all of us have talked about this problem from time to time. It was the recommendation of the Committee to Council, and the Council concurred, that it opposed bicameral legislation within our Association. The Committee noted there were many issues which crossed College and University Division lines, and it would be inadvisable to adopt a provision dividing voting.

However, the Committee and the Council are agreed that there are matters which come before our Convention which affect only a portion of our membership and probably should be rightfully resolved by those institutions involved. Consequently, at the direction of the Council, it is suggested that the membership take this into consideration when voting on an issue. This is not an attempt to restrict discussion on any amendment. We believe that all members should have the opportunity to ask questions and participate in the discussion, so that all positions may be known and all possibilities adequately explored. It is recommended, however, that legislation which pertains only to a portion of the membership may best be decided by those directly affected by the proposed legislation. The Council has therefore authorized the Chair to request that those not involved in an issue abstain from voting. It is understood each institution will have to make its own decision on the matter of abstention.

The committees responsible for the business of the Convention are listed in the Official Program. The chairman of the Committee on Voting, Frank Forbes, is ill and unable to be here. We will name someone to take his place shortly.

I call your attention to the circumstance that the Nominating Committee meets tomorrow evening. If you have suggestions please get in touch with the appropriate persons.

The mechanics of voting are outlined in what I have just said. At the business session on Wednesday, the room will be set in a fashion to give us eight sections to facilitate the counting by our Voting Committee. They are not intended to be sections occupied by persons from each respective district. It is merely a mechanical change to simplify the voting, so you are not restrained from sitting by members of your own district, but you don't have to sit with them either.

In the 1969-70 Annual Reports, the volume which you received at registration, you will find the reports of the rules and tournament committees and the reports of other committees. I will entertain a motion to receive those reports at this time.

[The motion that the Annual Reports be received was regularly made, seconded, put to voice vote and carried without dissent.]

4. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Francis E. Smiley (Colorado School of Mines): Mr. President, Members of the Association: The NCAA Executive Committee, elected annually by the Association's Council, consists of seven members plus the President, Secretary-Treasurer and Vice-President-At-Large. This

Committee is responsible for administering the Association's business and financial affairs, including the conduct of the National Collegiate and National College Division Championship events.

Regretfully, I begin this report on a somber note. Last July, intercollegiate athletics lost one of its most respected members with the sudden and untimely passing of James H. Weaver, commissioner of the Atlantic Coast Conference. Jim was a valued member of the Executive Committee. His keen mind was very helpful in our deliberations and his entertaining wit made the meetings more enjoyable.

The Association's general activities continue to increase and I trust that you find the NCAA News a valuable source of information. It was the Committee's conclusion that the News would be more useful if it were printed on the average of twice a month, thus enabling the Association to use the publication more effectively as the official vehicle for transmitting pertinent and necessary information to the membership. It is important for all members to pay particular attention to official interpretations published in the News as this constitutes official notice to the membership.

The Committee also authorized expansion of the Association's administrative staff and general reorganization. Bruce Skinner, recently of the University of Washington, was employed as editor of the News. Arthur J. Bergstrom has assumed the title of controller with responsibility for administering the Association's finances. Warren S. Brown has replaced Art as secretary to the Committee on Infractions and basically is responsible for interpretations. A full-time investigator has been employed for the enforcement program.

The Association intends to increase its promotion of NCAA championship events. Grayle W. Howlett III of the University of Michigan was employed last August as promotion director.

Our executive director, Walter Byers, was named to serve as program director for the NCAA football television series replacing Asa S. Bushnell, who has retired. Asa performed admirably, as you would expect, in his position as program director, and the Association is indebted to him for his many years of outstanding service. Thomas C. Hansen, in addition to his public relations duties, will assist Walter in administering the television program.

After the Council approved NCAA membership in the National Operating Committee on Standards for Athletic Equipment, the Executive Committee authorized a financial grant to assist that organization with its work. Other members include the National Junior College Athletic Association, the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, the American College Health Association, the American Medical Association and the Athletic Goods Manufacturing Association. NOCSAE is a nonprofit corporation formed to conduct research in specific areas in an effort to establish acceptable standards for athletic equipment. The first project is concerned with football helmets to curtail head and neck injuries.

We are happy to report that the National Summer Youth Sports Program was even more successful in 1970 than during its initial year of 1969. A total of 98 institutions in 54 cities participated and many others indicated interest, but could not be accommodated due to lack of funds. More than 36,000 young people enjoyed the program

on a regular basis. Total cost amounted to \$5,376,000. The Federal Government provided \$2,980,000 and the participating institutions contributed \$2,396,000. This is a significant and important program and we hope it can be expanded in 1971.

A part of the educational aspect of the NSYSP concerned drug abuse. Both the Executive Committee and Council have endorsed Association involvement in an educational program on drugs. We believe that there are a number of outstanding people in college athletics who can assume a leadership role in opposing the nontherapeutic use of drugs. A committee was appointed and is at work on this project under the chairmanship of Bob Pritchard. The committee has scheduled a presentation to the combined meeting of faculty representatives and athletic directors tomorrow morning.

Last year's Executive Committee report stated that the Investment Study Committee had been requested to investigate the feasibility of constructing a building to house the Association's executive headquarters. As a result, the Association has purchased 3.4 acres of land in Johnson County, Kansas, and has engaged an architectural firm to proceed with plans for a headquarters building. Once the architects have progressed to the point that we could ask for construction bids, the Executive Committee will review the Association's financial status before deciding when to proceed with construction. It is planned to consolidate our publishing operation, now in Phoenix, with our headquarters operation.

For several years, the Executive Committee and Council reports have mentioned the progress of the various sports federations in which the NCAA is a member. During 1970, there were two significant accomplishments which are destined to improve amateur athletics in this country.

Last October, the International Gymnastics Federation, known as FIG, formally recognized the United States Gymnastics Federation as the United States member, and the USGF has assumed its duties and responsibilities as the international franchise holder in the sport of gymnastics. The USGF has already done much to improve the sport of gymnastics domestically and we are confident that it will be a worthy representative internationally. Much of the success of the USGF must be credited to its energetic and imaginative executive director, Frank Bare.

In July, the International Wrestling Federation, known as FILA, voted to disaffiliate the Amateur Athletic Union as the United States member in that organization. The president of FILA recommended that the United States Wrestling Federation and the AAU form a commission to serve as this country's international representative in the sport of wrestling for an interim period not to exceed two years. The United States Wrestling Federation has made significant progress in its brief history and its impact on the sport of wrestling is already being recognized internationally. For example, the USWF will host the national wrestling team of the Soviet Union for a series of matches in March.

The Basketball, Baseball and Track and Field Federations also continue to make steady progress which bodes well for the future.

Turning to matters related to the conduct of NCAA championship

events, the Association negotiated a new two-year contract with the National Broadcasting Company for the rights to the 1971 and 1972 National Collegiate Basketball Championship. The Association will receive a 33 per cent increase in television rights fees and total television income for the basketball tournament in 1971 and 1972 is estimated at approximately \$1.5 million.

Lack of interest and participation caused the Executive Committee to discontinue sponsorship of the National Collegiate Trampoline Championships.

A new format will be in effect for the 1971 National Collegiate Wrestling Championships. District qualifying meets will be conducted early in March to determine a maximum field of 32 entrants per weight class for the finals, March 25-27. Wrestling has become so popular as a college sport it was necessary to establish some type of qualification procedure in order to limit the field to manageable proportions.

Preliminary preparations have been completed for the Association's initial National Collegiate Lacrosse Championship. The finals of this event will be contested at Hofstra University on June 5, 1971. We anticipate that the establishment of an NCAA championship will stimulate nationwide interest in this exciting sport.

The Executive Committee also established a formula whereby the Association will provide assistance to members who serve as hosts to NCAA events and incur a deficit. Under the formula, the NCAA will assume the cost of awards as may be necessary to offset a deficit. When an additional deficit remains, exclusive of the cost of hospitality, banquets and other social activities, the Association shall assume 50 per cent of such deficit up to a maximum of \$500 in cost to the Association.

Mr. President, I move that the report of the Executive Committee be accepted and approved, including the detailed accounting of our activities as recorded in the 1969-70 Annual Reports. This does not include revisions of Executive Regulations. They will be voted upon separately on Wednesday.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

5. REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

Richard P. Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. President and Members of the Association: It is my privilege to appear before you today on behalf of the Association's Council. As you know, the Council is responsible for the policy of the Association in the interim between Conventions.

The year 1970 was an extremely busy one for your Council. A review of the Council minutes as contained in the 1969-70 Annual Reports will provide you with some understanding of the scope of our activity. You should have received the Annual Reports at the time you registered and the minutes of the Council meetings may be found on pages 40 to 88.

During the year, we were stunned by the death of Raymond T. Ellickson of the University of Oregon, who served as District Eight vice-president. Robley Williams of the University of California, Berkeley, was named to take Ray's place.

Last January's report of the Council emphasized the financial problems confronting intercollegiate athletics. During the past year the Association completed an extensive study titled *AN ANALYSIS OF REVENUES, EXPENSES AND MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTING PRACTICES OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC PROGRAMS*. At this time the Council would like to thank our colleague, Arthur W. Nebel, and the University of Missouri for their significant contributions which made the study possible.

The results of the survey emphasized what has become all too apparent—expenses are increasing far more rapidly than income. A significant factor, however, is that for most of us our average total operating expense has increased more than 100 per cent during the last ten years.

One of the more significant conclusions of the survey is that expense reduction is impaired by the administrative competitiveness among institutions related to the size and operating methods of an intercollegiate athletic program. "Keeping up with the Joneses" can be an expensive proposition. As a result, when we should be considering the development of a more extended athletic program, too often we are curtailing the budgets of some sports because we feel we should spend more on those sports which gain the most spectator attention.

The study indicated that several of the expense items with which we are familiar could be controlled through institutional policy and/or NCAA and conference legislation. Consequently, there were several suggestions which are deserving of consideration including: (1) establishing grant-in-aid amounts on a need basis; (2) establishing a maximum limit on the number of grants-in-aid; (3) regulating campus visits by prospective student-athletes; (4) curtailing the recruiting expenses of member institutions; (5) establishing a national letter-of-intent; (6) considering the possibility of limiting the grants-in-aid to a maximum period of one year, and (7) the possibility of establishing limitations on athletic squad sizes for travel purposes.

This brings us to the report of the Special Committee on Financial Aid. I will not dwell on the findings and recommendations of this Committee because you have read them, discussed them and this afternoon at the round table session you will have the opportunity to probe the report in depth.

Your Council believes that the Financial Aid Committee, under the chairmanship of our respected Secretary-Treasurer, Bill Flynn, has made a most significant contribution. There is no legislation proposed at this Convention designed to implement the Committee's recommendations. The reaction of the membership to the various proposals will serve as a guide in future deliberations by the Council.

We hope when you return home you will give serious thought to the merits of the Financial Aid Committee's recommendations, not only for your institution but for intercollegiate athletics in general.

Another question which will be decided at this Convention relates to college athletics' position as a respectable part of the college community.

Bylaw 4-6-(b), more popularly referred to as the 1,600 rule, was adopted on January 13, 1965. The basis for its adoption was to insure that students representing NCAA member institutions in intercollegiate athletic competition—and especially in NCAA championship events—are, in fact, representative of the student bodies of their in-

stitutions not only athletically but academically.

The basic premise for adoption of this legislation is still sound. This legislation does not attempt to control admissions practices, but the Association's membership through the past five years has held the view it is reasonable to require the student-athlete to be, in fact, a representative student.

The Council continues to support Bylaw 4-6-(b) and does not believe that it should be repealed. The Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements, which has been responsible for the development and implementation of the 1,600 rule, and the Council have been sympathetic to the problems of member institutions, especially the desire to provide more opportunity to those students who are considered disadvantaged.

The Council-sponsored amendments to Bylaws 4-6-(b) appear in your Convention Program. It is anticipated the Council will have further comment on this question before the district meetings.

Basically, it is not the Council's intention to modify the rule to enable sub-predictors to compete immediately. But once a young man proves himself to be a worthy student, he would then have the opportunity to participate. Meanwhile, he would be entitled to receive financial aid if it were totally unrelated to his athletic ability.

The Council does not believe it is wrong to attempt to insure that a young man has as much opportunity to gain a degree as he does to compete in intercollegiate athletics, and that is what the 1,600 rule encourages, academic achievement.

The Council is again proposing an amendment which would enable the Council and the Convention to review the actions of the Association's various rules committees.

Please note that this year's amendment provides that if the Executive Committee, after consultation with the rules committee involved, determines that a rule is not appropriate for financial or other administrative reasons, the Executive Committee may recommend to the Council that such a rule be revoked or suspended. The Council will then receive the opinions of the rules committee and the Executive Committee and may make a decision to either revoke or suspend the rule or deny the Executive Committee's request for reconsideration.

Remember that Council actions are subject to review by the membership. This amendment is designed to require that the rules committees come under the same system of checks and balances as are all other committees of the Association. We do not feel that this is unreasonable, nor do we feel that it is an infringement upon the traditional operation of the Association's various rules committees.

In summary, we do not believe that any committee of the NCAA should have a separate, autonomous role, removed from review by the institutions which hold membership in the NCAA.

College and high school football again has been placed in the position of defending itself from the actions of professional football and, specifically, professional football telecasts. A federal statute which has been in effect since 1962, and subsequently amended when the two professional football leagues merged, affords certain protection from professional football telecasts to the high schools and colleges. The law stipulates that the pros cannot telecast within 75 miles of a high school or college game on Friday night or all day Saturday com-

mencing the second weekend in September and continuing through the second weekend in December. The National Football League contends that the law does not apply to those games which are carried on a local or regional basis and not telecast by major networks.

The NCAA, as well as the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations and the National Junior College Athletic Association, strongly disagree. Actual incidents prove that a professional football telecast by only one or two stations on a Friday night can seriously damage attendance at numerous high school games being played concurrently in the area of the telecast.

We plan to pursue this matter to the best of our ability to assure that school-college football has adequate protection on Friday nights and Saturday.

There are many other important matters which came to the attention of the Council in 1970 but, in the interest of time, let me briefly summarize only two additional matters.

The Council, in response to the resolution adopted by the Sixty-Fourth Annual Convention, has proceeded with the revision of the Constitution and Bylaws. We express our thanks to our long-time friend and colleague, George Young, of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, for his efforts and also to Louis J. Spry, the NCAA's director of research.

The revised Constitution and Bylaws, subject to amendment at this Convention, will become effective on August 1, 1971.

A thorough investigation of the amateur ice hockey programs in Canada has provided sufficient evidence for the Council to sponsor several amendments designed to insure that Canadian student-athletes are subject to professional rulings comparable to those enforced upon American students.

Mr. President, may I take this opportunity, on behalf of my fellow Council members, to thank you and your fellow officer, Bill Flynn, for the significant contributions you have made to intercollegiate athletics during the past two years. We have benefited greatly from your guidance and leadership.

This concludes my report and I again call the Convention's attention to the record of the Council's meetings contained in the Annual Reports. I move that the report of the Council for 1970 be received and approved, except for those interpretations printed in the Convention Program which will be voted upon separately Wednesday.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

6. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

John J. Horgan (Seton Hall University): Mr. President and Gentlemen: The tragedy and shock of 1970 struck Wichita State University and Marshall University and all of us in intercollegiate athletics. We all were deeply saddened and we all offer our deepest consolation to those two universities.

May I ask this membership, if you would, please, to stand for a few seconds in that concept.

[The assembly rose and stood in silent tribute in memory of those representatives of the two universities who had lost their lives in airplane accidents.]

Thank you. The Memorial Resolutions Committee for 1970 presents

to the Convention the following names of those who have passed away during the year 1970.

C. J. Alderson, University of Texas
 M. Beal Banks, Hartwick College
 Myron Begeman, University of Texas, Austin
 Deke Brackett, Marshall University
 Raymond J. Brancheau, New Mexico Western University
 Frank B. Bridges, Baylor University
 Harry C. Byrd, University of Maryland
 Al Carilli, Marshall University
 Felton G. Clark, Southern University
 Zora G. Clevenger, Indiana University
 A. Worth Collins, Baldwin-Wallace College
 W. Anthony Comerford, Boston College
 Russell Cook, Drake University
 Sam Corensweat, Sr., Sugar Bowl
 Henry Crisp, University of Alabama
 Dudley DeGroot, University of New Mexico
 Lilburn J. Dimmitt, Texas A&M University
 Henry J. (Harry) Downes, Boston College
 A. Bernard Drought, U. S. Naval Academy
 Raymond T. Ellickson, University of Oregon
 Floyd H. Farmer, Wichita State University
 Douglas Fessenden, San Francisco State College
 Brutus Hamilton, University of California at Berkeley
 Richard E. Hanley, Northwestern University
 Charles Harper, University of Alabama
 John Heldman, University of Louisville
 Bill Henry, Los Angeles Coliseum
 Robert Ingalls, University of Connecticut
 Richard Jamerson, University of North Carolina
 Wilhelm Kristian Janson, Luther College
 Dan Jessee, Trinity University
 Albert C. Katzenmeyer, Wichita State University
 Charles E. Kautz, Marshall University
 Joe Kirk, LaSalle College
 Robert Kirkpatrick, Wichita State University
 Donald Kirsch, University of Oregon
 Kenneth B. Knox, Southeast Missouri State College
 Joe Lapchick, St. John's University
 Robert Henry "Bob" Lee, Southern University
 Carney Laslie, University of Alabama
 Walter J. Livingston, Denison University
 Frank Loria, Marshall University
 Branch McCracken, Indiana University
 James McLane, Alfred University
 Richard C. Madison, Swarthmore College
 Gene Morehouse, Marshall University
 James Moss, Marshall University
 William (Doc) Newton, University of South Carolina
 Bryan O'Connors, Marshall University
 Bernard F. Oakes, University of Colorado
 Irving Olin, Brandeis University

Bennie Owen, University of Oklahoma
 Richard Papenguth, Purdue University
 Max (Skipper) Patrick, Missouri Valley Conference
 Dan C. Peden, Ohio University
 Herbert Read, Western Michigan University
 Henry N. Peters, Bucknell University
 Thomas A. Reeves, Wichita State University
 J. Earl Rudder, Texas A&M University
 Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
 Herman E. Sayger, Heidelberg College
 Oswald (Ossie) Salem, Springfield College
 Delos C. Schock, Princeton University
 Clark Shaughnessy, Stanford University
 Rick Tolley, Marshall University
 Irl Tubbs, University of Iowa
 Douglas Clyde Walker, Wake Forest University
 James H. Weaver, Atlantic Coast Conference
 E. G. (Ted) Whereatt, Indiana University
 Ben Wilson, Wichita State University
 John L. Wood, Wesleyan University
 Frank A. Yocum, Western Reserve University

Mr. President, this is the listing of those who have passed away in 1970. I submit this to the Association for the proper parchment and for condolences to be sent to the various families.

[The meeting recessed at 11:35 a.m.]

COMBINED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES AND ATHLETIC DIRECTORS ROUND TABLE

Monday Afternoon, January 11, 1971

The session was called to order at two-ten o'clock in Ballroom A, William J. Flynn, NCAA Secretary-Treasurer and director of athletics at Boston College, presiding.

Chairman Flynn: Gentlemen, I am Bill Flynn, the chairman of the Committee on Financial Aid.

One of the members last night said to me, "You and the Committee did a lot of work to cause one hell of an argument." [Laughter] As long as I can remember, people have discussed the possibility that it might be in the best interest of intercollegiate athletics to have financial aid based on need, and also that it might be also best if there were some limit set on the number of people you can aid in a particular sport.

The Council decided to appoint the Committee on Financial Aid to investigate and consider this subject more thoroughly. The members of the Committee, I assure you, have no crusade for this particular cause. We are going to present it to you and we want you to discuss it, to study it, to give us your ideas and then we will make a final report.

You all have received the Committee's Preliminary Report. The members of the Committee will present different parts of this report.

I want to introduce the Committee members who have spent a great deal of time and effort on this report:

John Bateman, head football coach, Rutgers University.

Jack Friel, commissioner, Big Sky Athletic Conference.

Boyd McWhorter, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, University of Georgia.

Seaver Peters, director of athletics, Dartmouth College.

Ed Sherman, chairman of the Department of Physical Education, Muskingum College.

Rix Snyder, director of special programs and former dean of admissions, Stanford University.

Willis Tate, president, Southern Methodist University, could not be with us this morning.

Fannie Vaughan, our recording secretary from the NCAA office.

In addition, Walter Byers sat in on all of our meetings as did Harry Cross, president of the NCAA.

Forest Evashevski attended several meetings until he left intercollegiate athletics, and Asa Bushnell attended until illness restricted his travel.

Another individual not at the podium, Bill Reed, commissioner of the Big Ten Conference, attended all but our first meeting and was of great help to us.

Jack Sawyer, faculty representative of Wake Forest University.

If I may quote the charge to the Committee from our preliminary report:

"The Council of the National Collegiate Athletic Association in October, 1969, voted to appoint a special committee to review the financial aid requirements of this Association to the end of determining the feasibility of (1) limiting the number of scholarships or grants-in-aid awarded by a member institution when athletic ability is a factor in any degree in determining the award, (2) inaugurating a national need formula to be utilized in the administration of such financial aid . . ."

In October, 1970, the Committee reported to the Council and it was determined that the program was feasible. The Council approved the report in principle, encouraged the Committee to proceed and authorized printing the preliminary conclusions and recommendations. The report has been sent to every president, every faculty representative and every athletic director in the NCAA.

Following the Convention the Committee will place its report and recommendations into final form. In other words, we will have to have several meetings after we find out what you don't like about it and what you think should be added to the report.

Then the Council would determine, perhaps by mail vote, whether or not we might want to have a special convention in the spring to determine whether or not we wanted to change our course of action.

H. Boyd McWhorter (University of Georgia): Gentlemen, our Preliminary Report contains six precepts or elements which members of the Committee felt were either ensuing benefit from this legislation or in some way were instrumental in our arriving at some of the details of the proposal.

This is not to say that each of these six elements would apply in every given situation, but in some form or other these are essential elements in the entire problem.

For example, the first one listed, the spiraling cost of intercollegiate athletics, goes without question.

Second is the belief on the part of the Committee that, assuming there are spiraling costs, those parents who are able to contribute to an athlete's education, should be asked to do this. This, of course, ties in with the need principle which will be discussed in detail later.

Third; the stockpiling of athletic talent by those institutions which are more affluent or working under no limitation. Many members of the Committee felt this would in some way make the competition fairer and would provide opportunities for more people to participate actively in this sport.

Fourth; selective recruiting, of course, is a moot point in the minds of many. This would concentrate your recruiting, however, in given areas rather than the shotgun approach sometimes now used.

The members of the Committee felt that with a restricted number you would be less likely to have a frustrated athlete on your hands in regard to his not being able to participate or cut it academically, as the case may be.

No. 5. I come from a section of the country where need is indeed alien or foreign in regard to athletic grants-in-aid. Speaking as an academician, it is not alien in regard to other types of scholarships on the campus, national merit being one in point. It is felt as though

by sweeping the athletic grant-in-aid into the mainstream of the common type of scholarship on your campus will put a better posture on intercollegiate athletics and provide more funds for other types of scholarships.

No. 6. If any legislation comes about in any of the three areas which we are discussing, it will have to be enacted on a national basis rather than an institutional or conference basis.

The first part of this report points out the crisis that faces higher education. This section is based on a report which will give most academic administrators nightmares. The now famous Carnegie Report, "A New Crisis in Education," has brought to the attention of every institution that we are indeed in economic straits when it comes to higher education. This report takes 41 institutions as samples—private, public, large, small. Of these 41 institutions, only 12 the report concluded were not then in financial difficulties or headed in that direction, and taking some 2300 institutions they concluded that 1500 of these were either in financial difficulty or headed in that direction.

Intercollegiate athletics, as you gentlemen well know, is constantly under attack from many, many sources and has to justify its existence almost every day. I spend most of my time doing this, but I find it very difficult if not impossible when I am called upon as a dean to block out the budget, to give walking papers to some members of the faculty, to curtail some programs, to eliminate altogether some programs, not to realize that we must economize across-the-board. I feel beyond a shadow of a doubt that if people who are interested in intercollegiate athletics and its welfare are not willing to show that they are concerned about spiraling costs, and make a bona fide attempt to do something about it, then people who are not as sympathetic or as knowledgeable about intercollegiate athletics will come in and do it for them.

The idea of one-platoon football was never a matter of consideration. We started from economics, competition, and the other broad philosophical principles that we have, and for this reason, it is imperative that we enact something that will show the entire academic community that the National Collegiate Athletic Association is concerned about the economic aspect of higher education.

Rixford K. Snyder (Stanford University): The elements of the problem to which this Committee has addressed itself are set forth dramatically in the appendices which are numbered I, II and III of the Preliminary Report of your Committee which has been distributed to all member institutions of the NCAA and copies of which are in the lobby outside this meeting room.

There is of course the element of rising costs which are being experienced every year and in every segment of our national fiber. The data which is presented in these three graphs was obtained from the comprehensive financial study made by the NCAA of all its members in 1969 and published in July 1970, and again distributed to all members.

I have removed appendix I from the back of my book. It lists in five bargraphs, the dollar and percentage increase of costs for intercollegiate athletics from 1960 to 1969. The figures were presented for five categories of institutions within the NCAA. Category A at the

top is 118 institutions ranked major in both football and basketball. This is based on the relative strength of their football schedule.

Category B includes 157 institutions in the College Division I in football. The distinction between Category A and Category B lies in the relative strength of their football opponents.

Category C includes 170 institutions in College Division II. The distinctions between Class B and Class C are based primarily on the extent and nature of their grants-in-aid as well as on the relative degree of their competitiveness in football.

Category D includes 40 institutions that do not currently sponsor intercollegiate football, but are ranked major in basketball.

Finally, Category E includes 170 institutions which do not currently sponsor intercollegiate football, and which are also not major competitors in basketball.

The national study reveals that with the exception of Category D, operating expenses for NCAA members have more than doubled in the last ten years. For Category D, the 40 institutions that do not sponsor intercollegiate football but are ranked major in basketball, the total expenses increased by more than 50 per cent.

Appendix II presents bar graphs which will illustrate how the 10-year rise in cost can be divided by factors for the 118 institutions in Category A. This was done for Category A only.

Approximately 35 per cent of the rise in cost was by inflationary trend over which we as individual institutions or indeed we of the NCAA have no control, but which is nevertheless a very prime factor in the growing possibility that university administrators throughout the land will turn to intercollegiate athletic programs as one of the areas in which substantial adjustments can be made in order to bring their own situations to some greater or better financial balance.

Approximately two-thirds of the rise this graph shows is the result of more athletes being included in the program and greater activity services including of course financial aid being extended to them.

Our Committee has addressed itself particularly to the rising cost of financial aid to student-athletes. We have done this because of several hypotheses which are clearly set forth in the last paragraph on page 9 and the first paragraph on page 10 of the Preliminary Report.

From these hypotheses, the fact emerges that the one area where we can both control cost and not handicap our intercollegiate athletic program is the area of financial aid.

Appendix III, for example, shows the average total grants-in-aid cost of all five categories of members during the last five years, and the percentage increase over the five-year period which is at the bottom of each of the five categories. They ranged from 82 per cent in the case of Category B to 24 per cent in the case of Category D.

We believe that the proposals we are suggesting will bring about considerable financial improvement for the members, would not handicap our athletic program and would bring about additional benefit of substantial merit to which Mr. McWhorter has referred.

The financial improvement might be illustrated by the data from my own institution Stanford University. During the current academic year, 1970-71, we are spending in financial aid to student-athlete

programs approximately \$420,000. We are on a modified need formula in our granting of aid to student-athletes. If we were to go to a full need program our cost would be \$175,000. In short, under this proposal we would actually be saving \$254,000 in student aids to athletes, or to put it another way, for every dollar we are now spending on financial aid, we would be spending only 40 cents.

John W. Sawyer (Wake Forest University): Several of the members of this Committee have had previous experience on some committees of the NCAA. This is my first major NCAA Committee, so they were kind enough to take the controversial items and leave me with the insignificant item of the need formula. [Laughter]

What I am to do today is to discuss with you the concept of financial aid based on need and to present to you the proposal of this Committee relative to this concept.

In this discussion, when we speak of financial aid, or aid or grant-in-aid, we mean exactly the same general type already governed by the NCAA and spelled out explicitly in its Constitution and Bylaws, that is, aid in which the recipient's athletic ability was considered in some degree in determining the award.

Nearly all scholarships for undergraduates in most institutions are based to some extent upon a showing of financial need. This means that in determining the amount of aid to be awarded account is taken of the financial resources of the recipient and those from whom he derives his support.

It is true that there are some undergraduate scholarships which do not require a need factor to be considered, and it is true that in general graduate scholarships are not based on need. However, with the supply of graduate students now exceeding the demand don't be surprised to see the need factor apply to graduate scholarships in the near future.

But in general, only aid to athletes is not subject to need consideration. So it is very important to note here the Committee is not proposing something that is different from existing practice in American colleges and universities.

It can be noted, for example, that the College Scholarship Service and the American College Testing Student Need Analysis Service has more than 1000 institutions of higher education as clients. Twenty-two states have their own scholarship programs. All 22 use need in making their awards.

The National Merit Scholarship Program, which was mentioned by Boyd McWhorter, with scholarships in many institutions throughout the nation, operates from the need basis.

One might ask: Why have national legislation on this? Why not just leave it up to the individual institutions? Or what about acting in a group, such as a conference? This is exactly what the Big Ten Conference did some years ago, but the Big Ten then became an island surrounded by competitors who were not using a need factor and the Big Ten was at a definite disadvantage in trying to recruit against those institutions which did not use a need basis.

This one illustration is sufficient to point out why it is absolutely necessary that if any legislation of this nature is adopted it must be on a national basis. If everyone is subject to the same limitation no one has a competitive defense.

The Committee studied information from various member institutions, information similar to what Rix Snyder gave a moment ago. This information was obtained on a confidential basis from several institutions, and without disclosing those institutions or even the regions which they represent, it is sufficient to note that the need program to be proposed by the Committee could result in scholarship and grant-in-aid savings ranging from 30 per cent to 60 per cent. The larger percentages were noted for those institutions whose educational requirements are not in the highest brackets, for example, state universities.

So much for the philosophy behind the thinking of the Committee. Now what about the details?

The Committee recommends that legislation be passed implementing the philosophy that NCAA members granting financial aid to athletes base all such aid on what is reasonably needed by a student to finance his college education; in other words, to adopt a need basis for awarding aid to athletes.

The first question naturally is: How can this need be determined? As was mentioned previously, the two major services now in use each have approximately 1000 institutions as clients, so obviously there is precedent for determining need. Now, it is true that the process can be made unwieldy, it can be made overcomplicated, it can be made difficult to administer. To try to avoid these pitfalls, the Committee is presenting what we think is a simple, practical and reliable method of implementing need principles. We believe that it can be administered without undue complication or red tape or evasion.

The term "educational equivalent" is used extensively in what follows in this discussion. Educational equivalent at any institution has been defined by the Committee as tuition, mandatory fees, board, room at campus rates for double occupancy, plus incidental expenses of not more than \$30 per month. Not \$15 per month, but \$30 per month or \$270 per year. That is tuition, fees, board, room, \$30 a month. You notice I did not say anything about books or supplies. The Committee recommends, further, that books and course-related supplies, not in cash but in kind, up to \$180 per academic year be made available to all student-athletes regardless of need. This would not be included then in the computation of educational equipment. All student-athletes would be entitled to books and supplies, regardless of need.

Now, limitation of aid applies when unearned financial aid is awarded to a student when athletic ability in some degree has been taken into consideration in making the award. Such aid, combined with other aid the student may receive from employment during semester or term time, other scholarships or grants-in-aid and like sources, together with the so-called expected family contribution must not exceed the educational equivalent, that is, the financial aid from the institution, together with employment during the school year, together with any other scholarship such as government grants, together with the expected family contribution must not exceed the educational equivalent which was defined by the Committee.

This phrase "expected family contribution" is simply a dollar figure representing an amount which logically and practically could be ex-

pected to be paid toward educational costs from available sources or sources available to the recipient.

The plan proposed by the Committee gives a very simple way of determining this expected family contribution, and it also allows for computations for a self-supporting system.

The computation begins with a confidential application form which we will look at in more detail in a moment. It is printed on page 31 of our report as Appendix IV. The applicant together with all persons from whom he receives financial support completes this brief form, stating adjusted gross income as shown on the Federal income tax return, deductions either itemized or standard 10 per cent deduction as shown on this return, and the number of exemptions which he is claiming in his return. Only those three things: adjusted gross income, deductions, exemptions.

This form is submitted only to the NCAA office, not to the individual institution, or it may go to a contracted agent of the NCAA for computation purposes.

The form also allows for listing of extraordinary financial circumstances which the applicant believes should be noted and which may be taken into consideration in the final computation.

The evaluation procedure is not complicated. The deductions are subtracted from the adjusted gross income. The remainder is identified as income. Adjusted gross income, minus deductions, gives net income.

Then we go to the table. This net income can be located in the approved and official NCAA table, and opposite this figure in the table can be found the expected family contribution listed for varying numbers of dependents. We will take a closer look at this table in a moment.

Now the use of the adjusted gross income figure accounts for all income of any type—stocks, bonds, wages, salaries, farm, business, or what have you. By using itemized deductions one can get relief for heavy medical bills, high interest payments, high taxes and other unusual expenses. Also—and this is important—provision is made for additional relief for those families with more than one child in college.

Once this expected family contribution has been determined, the difference between it and the educational equivalent represents the maximum aid which can be awarded by an institution, the difference between the expected family contribution and the educational equivalent.

For example, if an institution has an educational equivalent of \$3000 and the expected family contribution is \$1000, then the institution can award \$2000 in aid. This means that the family would not have to pay more than \$1000, regardless of which institution the applicant attends. It costs him the same to go to any institution.

The evaluation report, which shows the expected family contribution, will be sent only to those institutions designated by the applicant. It will contain no financial information except a single figure, such as \$575, which will represent the expected family contribution. No income figures will be furnished, so there is not a loss of privacy in this connection.

For those institutions which already require the use of one of the established financial need services, provision is made for them to

continue such usage with a restriction; that is to say, under present circumstances an institution can make adjustments even though it is furnished an expected family contribution. It can require less of the family under present circumstances. What we are tying into our proposal is if an institution uses one of the other established need-evaluation services it cannot make any adjustment which would result in giving aid in excess of what would be allowable under the NCAA computation.

To be a bit more specific, let's look at the application form as found on page 31 of the report. This is Appendix IV, a financial aid application form. Any time you see anything this long it looks complicated, but when you look at it carefully you notice the first part is just a straightforward identification: name, birth date, for further identification and so on, street address, city, this type of thing.

Under Income Information you notice we have two blocks for income information, Section A and Section B. It was decided perhaps it would be well to see the information for two consecutive years just for further checking purpose or to help establish unusual circumstances, anything of that nature.

The basic portion of this is simply adjusted gross income, and we tell where on the tax form this can be found, although if this goes into use we probably will have to change those line numbers since the Internal Revenue Service never can make up its mind where it wants the information to be.

In the column, for example, opposite Adjusted Gross Income we say: "for applicant only, do not include income from wages or salary." The Committee decided if the boy wants to work during the summer, while his friend goes to the beach, it won't penalize the industrious.

Item C gives some identification of his brothers and sisters, including also information about those who may be in school. If they are living in school what per cent of school expenses are paid by scholarship payments? All of this will be used in any adjustment for the expected family contribution.

Section D simply sweeps up a listing of any other exemptions claimed on the facts returned.

Section E allows space for a listing of extraordinary circumstances.

At the bottom is a release form which is common to all similar application forms of all established need evaluation services, which gives permission to the NCAA to verify this information in case a question is raised, and agrees to allow it to be used in the prescribed way, simply by establishing the expected family contribution.

Now, Appendix V includes a portion of the table for expected family contribution. Actually the table is set up to go as high as anyone's income can be found. Here it goes up to just \$16,400, but it is to go up as high as anyone would want.

Page 33 spells out the procedure for determining the expected family contribution. I think this can be seen a little better however by looking at the illustrative example on page 34.

In Form 1, we have the situation where the father and mother filed a joint return with an adjusted gross income of \$15,000. They listed deductions of \$1200. They have two children, counting the applicant.

There is also a dependent grandmother. The applicant is the only child in college.

So first the net income is calculated; the adjusted gross income of \$15,000, minus deductions of \$1200, leaves \$13,800. Then in your table opposite \$13,800 you look over to the column for three dependent children. Where there are two children and a dependent grandmother it is three, just like a dependent child. Opposite \$13,800, under three dependent children, you see the figure \$1000. That would be the expected family contribution.

Now no adjustment is made here because there are no other children in college.

Example 2 is a more complicated setup, where there are other children in college. Before going into this, the basic principle is that if you have two children in college and you are already paying the full expense of one of them, your expected contribution will be divided by two. If you have three children in college and are already paying full expenses for two, your expected family contribution would be divided by three.

We took into consideration the case in which the children are in college, receiving a certain amount of scholarship aid already, and instead of giving credit for all of one child we give credit for a fraction of the child. This sounds heartless, to talk about a fraction of a child.

In Example 2, the father and mother filed a joint return with adjusted gross income of \$20,000 and there were deductions of \$1700. There are four children, counting the applicant. There are two children already in college, other than the applicant. One of these children lives at home and goes to college. The other is in college with 25 per cent scholarship paid.

We start out as before by telling a net income, \$20,000 minus \$1700 deductions to get \$18,300. Unfortunately, we do not have the \$18,300 in this table, but I assure you if we did have you would find \$1505 as expected family contribution.

Now we start into the adjustment process. For the one child in college, living at home, we know that it does not cost as much for a child living at home as it would in the dormitory, so we give credit here for the child. We add .50 to the adjustment factor. The other child lives at college and has 25 per cent scholarship fee, so we allow for the adjustment factor .75. We give credit for three-quarters of a child here. Then for the applicant we add one. The sum of these adds up to 2.25 children in college. This \$1505 is divided by 2.25 and to the nearest dollar comes out \$669. So \$669 would be the expected family contribution for this one applicant.

In Example 3, the father is deceased and the mother has an adjusted gross income of \$6000 with 10 per cent standard deduction, \$600. There are four children, none in college, other than the applicant. So the net income of \$6000 minus \$600 would be \$5400.

Now, opposite \$5400, under four children, gets you up into the blank space up near the top where all figures are taken to be minus \$270. The minus indicates that this much actual cash can be paid out. In other words, in this case the applicant can receive full aid plus \$270 in cash. Only where there is a minus sign can actual cash be paid. The \$270 for incidental expenses has been subtracted in advance from the

family's expected contribution all through this thing, and only when the parent's expected contribution is less than \$270 does an actual cash payment come into being.

We realize this is not a finished package by any means and there will be many administrative details, but what we wanted to do at this point was simply present a feasible package to show that the idea of the evaluation of need can be carried out.

Chairman Flynn: The second part of the proposal has to do with the limitation of the number of grants in football and basketball. This doesn't mean it could not be extended at a future date to other sports, but the Committee paid attention to these two, because the NCAA revenue and expense studies show that by far the greatest expense had to do with these two.

The Committee proposed that there be 30 initial commitments allowed per year in football, with a banking privilege of five, and six in basketball with a banking privilege of two.

In addition to a financial saving that would result from the limitation in the number of grants there would also be other substantial benefits accrued.

The stockpiling of athletic talent by one institution would be eliminated. There would be undoubtedly closer competition between colleges and also better athletic opportunities for the student-athletes under the pressure put on the institution representative to be more selective in his recruiting. There is a strong incentive to avoid recruiting an athlete who is in danger of becoming an academic casualty.

With 30 initial awards in football and six in basketball each year it would be possible, if a maximum were used and there were no casualties, to have a store of 120 football players and 24 basketball players, that is, in institutions that use the four-year rule. In those that allow five years the number could run as high as 150 football players and 30 basketball players. These figures do not take into account the unrecruited volunteer, the boy who makes the football team without being recruited and without being aided.

The carryover or bank arrangement introduces flexibility in the system. If a college issues less than 30 grants per year, then they put them in the bank. So if you issue 20 this year you have 10 in the bank. However, at no time can you draw more than five from the bank, so next year you would be entitled to 35.

To start out, the Committee proposes that everybody have a bank of 10 awards in football and two in basketball, so starting out you could give 35 awards the first year and you could give 35 awards the second year because you would have 10 in the bank to start out.

One danger arising from limitations on the number of awards is what is known as the "runoff." To eliminate this temptation, the plan provides for an annual numerical limit as specified so that once an initial award has been issued and a student has enrolled, that award may not be replaced. So if you have 30 and five drop out, you cannot replace them the next year. Everyone on your freshman team and varsity team would have to be listed.

That listing is divided into two parts, the registered and the non-registered. The registered ones are the 30 that count against you. The nonregistered ones do not count against you, but all must be listed, so at the start of their freshman year you list everybody on your fresh-

man squad in two parts—registered and nonregistered.

Now, only people who are listed may represent you in varsity competition. This does not in any way interfere with the junior varsity program or the 150-pound team or practicing. The boy may practice and not be listed or registered. It is only when a boy competes that he has to be listed.

Now, a transfer student would, in effect, be subject to the same procedure as a freshman. Let me give you an example of a freshman squad. You would have to register any boy who was recruited under O.I. 100 and given aid in which athletic ability was a consideration. Everybody has to be listed.

Secondly, any boy who signed a candidate's acceptance form or comparable conference instrument. Any boy who signed—putting it in terminology of today—an interconference letter-of-intent would have to be registered.

Any boy who receives a job either in summertime or during the school year, and who obtained that job through the intercession of a member of the athletic staff, would have to be registered.

When you get to the varsity level, everyone who was registered as a freshman would naturally have to be registered as a sophomore.

However, two additional classes now have to be registered. If you recruited a freshman and he received aid, but the aid was not related to athletics, you would not have to register him as a freshman, but if he was going to play on the varsity he would have to be registered.

The boy who was recruited and did not receive aid would have to be registered when he joins the varsity.

That may sound complicated, but to put it in simpler terms, any boy who was recruited under O.I. 100 must be counted if he is going to play on the varsity team. If he has been recruited, whether he has aid or not, he has to be registered.

There are two student-athletes that never have to be registered and do not count against you. They are the boy who has not been recruited and is receiving aid that has nothing to do with his athletic ability, and the boy who has not been recruited and is not receiving aid. They have to be listed as members of the squad but they do not count against you.

Edgar A. Sherman (Muskingum College): Mr. Chairman, varsity teams of institutions that use freshmen can be made up of players that fall into one of two categories: those already registered and those who are listed but not registered. Let's take those who are registered, first. That would include any previously registered player. It would include not more than 30 newly registered players plus the five that you might draw out of the bank.

Again, in that group of registered players you have players who have been recruited as defined in O.I. 100 and are receiving financial aid in which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in some degree. That is the first group.

The second group would be players who have been recruited and who have signed the candidate's acceptance form.

The third group, registered people, would be players who have not been recruited and are not receiving aid based in any degree upon their athletic ability, but have been provided a job either during the summer or the academic year due to the intercession of a member of

the athletic staff or a representative of the athletic interest.

Let's take a look at the people who would not have to be registered. There are two kinds of players in that category.

First are the players who have not been recruited and who are receiving institutional financial aid, provided there is on file in the office of the director of athletics a certificate by the faculty athletic representative, the admissions director and the chairman of the financial aid committee in which they state that the grant was without regard in any degree to their athletic ability.

Another group listed but not registered, in that category, are players who have not been recruited, who have not signed the candidate's acceptance form and are not receiving any kind of financial aid.

John F. Bateman (Rutgers University): In order to implement the candidate's acceptance form, the Committee recommended that common ground rules be established as to the timing of offers of financial aid and the acceptance thereof. Such a policy is essential to the operation of the foregoing system of limitations and to lessen the undesirable pressures of recruiting.

The program is as follows:

A. There shall be no offer of financial aid to a prospective athlete (O.I. 100) made prior to the beginning of his senior year in high school.

B. Acceptance forms in numbers not in excess of the maximum registration quota may be mailed to prospective students after midnight on the Friday nearest May 1. The mailing of such a form constitutes a firm commitment on the part of the institution that if the declaration is duly returned within the proper time, the tendered financial aid will be made available to the student if he enrolls.

C. The student's acceptance must be returned by mail under postmark date no later than midnight between May 15 and May 16. If the form is returned at a later time, the institution may grant or refuse to grant the aid as it chooses, provided the institution notifies the student of his acceptance or nonacceptance within 10 days after the form is received by the institution.

D. No contact can be initiated by an institutional representative during the period of 24 hours before the declaration form may be mailed until noon of the Friday following mailing date. In other words, there is a definite cooling off period which has been instituted by other institutions that was found to be very acceptable.

E. After the initial mailing period, additional acceptance forms may be utilized by an institution until August 15. Each subsequent form must be returned within two weeks and if the form is returned at a later time the institution may grant or refuse to grant the aid as it chooses, provided the institution notifies the student within 10 days after the form is received.

F. Between August 15 and May 1, the candidate's acceptance procedure may not be utilized. Mid-year prospects (students coming in at midyear or transfers) therefore would not be subject to the candidate's acceptance program.

In utilizing the supplementary candidate's acceptance forms the institution, of course, must exercise care so as not to exceed the quota limitation.

The form will specify that the respondent loses his first year of

varsity eligibility in all intercollegiate sports if he attends an institution other than the one to which he commits and is accepted. He would jeopardize his total eligibility if he completes and returns forms to more than one institution.

This program would not affect the various procedures used by institutions and conferences in which prospective students are asked to indicate their enrollment intentions. These programs could continue. All member institutions of the Association, however, would be required to respect the NCAA candidate's acceptance program, even though they choose not to participate in the program.

Jack Friel (Big Sky Athletic Conference): There are a number of questions which have been posed by the Committee members themselves in the process of working on this matter, and also a number of them came from the outside. At each Committee meeting these questions were discussed and the answers set forth here are the consensus of the Committee.

Will the "need" program encourage "under-the-table payments to relieve the family of its required contribution?"

The Committee has considered this at length and does not believe the possibility is of significant consequence, for these reasons: (1) the recommended formula is more generous than other existing "need" formulae and doesn't place an undue hardship upon the truly needy family; (2) the total need applicant qualifies for greater financial aid than now permitted under NCAA legislation; (3) all institutions, in effect, are able to provide financial assistance in identical terms, thus minimizing the competitive financial pressures, and (4) the NCAA Executive Committee has authorized increased manpower and funds for the Association's enforcement program.

Chairman Flynn: On page 36 of the Preliminary Report is a definition of recruitment, which is proposed to replace O.I. 100. Actually, this is separate from our proposal. This is going to be put on the floor of the Convention on Wednesday for approval or disapproval, but it has a lot to do with our proposal and is used a great deal in the proposal because we say it has to do with O.I. 100.

Seaver Peters (Dartmouth College): The terms "student-athlete," and "recruited" as used in this report, and particularly in that part dealing with limitations on the number of financial aid awards, are defined by revised Official Interpretation 100, as approved by the NCAA Council. The revised O.I. 100 is subject to review by the Convention at the business session on Wednesday.

The first paragraph is worthy of repetition at this time:

"A student-athlete is a student whose matriculation was solicited by a member of the athletic staff or other representative of athletic interests with a view toward the student's ultimate participation in the varsity intercollegiate athletic program. Any other student becomes a student-athlete only when he reports for a freshman or varsity squad which is under the jurisdiction of the department of intercollegiate athletics. A student is not deemed a student-athlete solely because of his prior participation in high school athletics."

Paragraphs (a) and (b) below are most significant in O.I. 100.

Paragraph (a) outlines when a prospective student becomes a student-athlete, and conversely, (b) outlines what contacts can be made

to allow a prospective student to remain just that, not a student-athlete.

I want to emphasize that this proposal is less restrictive and again you will be asked to act on the interpretation sometime Wednesday. For your information, in addition to printing of this proposed revision in the O.I. in the Financial Aid Report, it is also on page 30 of your Convention Program.

Chairman Flynn: That ends the presentation of the Preliminary Report of the Committee on Financial Aid. Now we are going to ask for questions.

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas and President of the American Football Coaches Association): I would like to say to this Committee that the Coaches Association very much appreciates the work that has gone into this report and into this proposed legislation.

I think I am speaking on behalf of the vast majority of the coaches when I say we are concerned with the spiraling costs, just as you delegates are. You also will agree that we coaches have the most to lose if someone other than this group takes action against intercollegiate athletics.

We also agree that since the coaches have to implement this proposed legislation, it is important that the Coaches Association form a committee to review these proposals. Although we have not had very much time, just the last 30 days, we have come up with some observations and comments.

There is very little legislation that has been proposed or will be in the next few years that hasn't been tried before. The coaches are well aware of the problems in any legislation, including anything that is in this report some of which has been tried by some conferences or some individual institutions.

We have a committee, headed by Eddie Crowder of Colorado, to whom I would like to relinquish this microphone, to give observations and comments from the Coaches Association.

Eddie Crowder (University of Colorado): Mr. Chairman, we coaches have reviewed extensively individually prior to arrival here and last night as a group the material that has been prepared. We, as Frank pointed out, do recognize and concur with the great need to control rising costs. In the interest of doing that, I think I represent most of the coaches when I say our greatest concern is one of maintaining equity among the various schools so that while creating a cure for the patient the side effects do not kill him. In an effort to do that, our concern is to review all proposals in the nature of controlling expenditures and rising costs in the light of what it is going to do to athletics.

As you might assume, a great many questions have been raised by the coaches as we discussed these proposals.

The first is whether or not equity is created in view of the various costs of living across the United States. Is a boy from a small town in Texas with a parental income of \$10,000 in the same circumstances as a boy from Chicago, for example, or Dallas?

Next is the question of invalid financial statement. I notice there is a request at the bottom of the financial form asking that the parent indicate his willingness to have his income tax form reviewed. I have had, not from coaches but from a vast number of others, doubts that people will be willing to do that.

Another point which is well worth consideration is the question of incentive. When a young man from a family that has a little more financial wherewithal is asked to pay for his education in toto and at the same time participate versus a young man whose education is free, is the incentive reduced from the point of the young man in better financial circumstances?

At Colorado, a young man participated as a starting player as a sophomore. He came from a family that had enough circumstances, but the father insisted that he was not going to let the boy have financial aid. The boy did play as a sophomore and played quite well, quite satisfactorily, and it seemed to be a very rewarding experience for him. Nevertheless, at the end of the season he came in and indicated that one of his great interests in this program in college athletics was that of financial independence from his family, and since he was not able to gain that he no longer was interested in participating.

This point might be examined further in relation to the high school athlete. A young man from a family with enough wherewithal would know that under our current system by outstanding performance he might be able to maintain himself and provide his own education. If you remove that he will know that due to his family's income he will not be able to earn his own education.

Another significant item is the greater burden placed on the individual from the least strength in the financial home situation. I can foresee the burden of recruiting becoming so intense on the young man from the economically deprived circumstances that it will greatly add to the burden of recruiting for that young fellow.

Another point, and to me this is the greatest one, is the economic inequity that will in fact present more problems for the very institutions which are having the greatest problem. I am going to use the University of Texas as an example, if I may. Texas has an educational equivalent of approximately \$1500 annually per student. Southern Methodist University has an educational equivalent in excess of \$3000. If the young man's financial determination is that his family contribution is \$2000 he may go to the University of Texas free. He may go to Southern Methodist University for \$1000. This creates a burden for the school already suffering.

Without question for those of us practically involved in recruitment, subterfuge occurs when inequity exists. When one fellow does something I cannot do or vice versa, it immediately places a burden upon those who are in the pressure business of obtaining the services of these young people, and there is an apparent necessity now to do something to, in fact, gain an equality of opportunity.

It strongly suggests to me and to others with whom I have discussed this that those who are already at a disadvantage are going to be even more disadvantaged, and those schools which are for the most part private schools with higher tuition will have the greatest difficulty in dealing with the inequity.

The efforts of this committee and the interest of the NCAA as a body are correct. There is no question that practically no institution now exists that is free of financial strain and stresses.

Rather than formulate policies, procedures and rules implemented as theoretical solutions, we request that the membership of NCAA give consideration to the fact that we as coaches would like very

much to participate in the formulation of NCAA rules which first are solutions to the financial problems and secondly are practical.

Ara Parseghian (University of Notre Dame): Mr. Chairman, I imagine any of my fellow coaches sitting here may be better qualified to express an opinion than I. It jogged my memory as I listened to the need program being presented because the Big Ten Conference was involved with this for four or five years. Bob Blackman, now with the University of Illinois, was involved with a need program for a long period of time.

As I listened, it jogged my memory on one or two things. As was expressed by a Committee member, the Big Ten was on an island. It still is alone in a sense with the surrounding competition being able to award more scholarships. Also, any scholarship recipient in the top quarter of his class could receive full aid regardless of his economic status.

I recall a couple of instances, and they worked two ways. I happened to be at Northwestern at the time and I believe our annual costs were around \$3500 a year and the costs at Illinois were about \$1150.

A man could come up with a situation where it would cost the family \$3500 to come to Northwestern University. The father would say to me, "Coach, I can send my boy to Illinois for \$1150, give him \$100 a month spending money and spend less than it is going to cost me to send him to Northwestern." We were in the same conference, competing against each other. I had to sell him on the idea that the boy would have a better education.

Inversely, when it comes to a \$1000 computation, I can say to the individual, "You can come to Northwestern and I can give you a \$2500 scholarship." Illinois can say, "I can give you a \$150 scholarship."

A couple of other things come to my mind that I recall vividly. There was a professional man who lived in a palatial home, obviously a very affluent individual. His computation came up to a dead zero, which meant that we could give his son a full scholarship, and he was no more qualified for it than any man making \$100,000.

Another gentleman who came in was a black athlete from Cleveland, Ohio. His dad was working two jobs. He was moonlighting, working all day, 18 hours a day, and got his income up to \$7000 per year. He was working to earn it and he wound up with a computation of \$770.

This is very close to what it was in the Big Ten, about 10 per cent of adjusted income. He said, "Coach, I can keep the boy right here at home and send him to one of the local state schools. If I am going to pay \$770 to send him to your place, I will keep him right here in Cleveland in one of the small state schools and pay \$45 tuition." I thought it was very unfair.

As any parent can point out, \$10,000 in a rural community as opposed to \$10,000 in a city environment is totally different.

This computation is based on the previous year's income. We are going through economic problems today where people who made \$20,000 a year ago are unemployed today. This computation is based on the previous year. Is any relief provided for that individual who comes in, whose dad is unemployed and has to come up with \$1500?

As I recall, the total assets were recorded. A man who was very

frugal and willing to save his money was at a disadvantage as opposed to an individual who spent every dime he made.

John W. Sawyer (Wake Forest University): In response to one specific thing Coach Parseghian said, we do have provision for an applicant to ask for re-evaluation of his situation any time after he enters the university. In other words, we work up the expected family contribution on the basis of the previous year's income, but if the income is changed he can ask for re-evaluation at any time. We do not require a re-evaluation, but he can ask for one and get it any time.

John Coyle (Pennsylvania State University): One comment about the requirements here. The recommendation, of course, comes out strongly for basing scholarships on financial need, but this extended report, *FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS*, does not have any information about the savings which would accrue from such a program.

There have been some comments made that there could be perhaps 30 per cent savings or in some instances as much as 60 per cent savings based upon some sample of schools, and we have no information as to what that sample would be.

Before we could vote with some competence about the savings which might accrue from such a program, we would have to have some information of this nature provided to us in more detail.

Bob Blackman (University of Illinois): I am from the University of Illinois, late from Dartmouth College. My friends ask, "Did this really work in the Ivy League." In all honesty I have to say, yes, it did. It was a very fine program.

There were eight colleges which were somewhat unique in many ways. One of the first ways these eight colleges were unique was their total cost each year was very similar, in many cases identical. I believe at the present time the budgets being used among the eight Ivy League schools vary from \$4300 a year to \$4500 a year. There was never more than \$200 difference.

Ed Crowder made the point about one school costing \$2000 and another \$4000 and that boy qualified for \$2000 of aid, therefore the school with the low cost had the big advantage. This also works the other way. Let's say a boy qualifies for only \$1000 of aid and one school costs \$2000 and the other costs \$4500. Any of you who know human nature know you like to get a bargain. If any of you gentlemen were told you could buy a \$2000 car for \$1000 or you could buy a \$4500 car for \$1000, which one would you take? I think most of you would say, "I would like the \$4500 car." You are getting more here and it costs you the same, but you are getting a lot more because our costs are a lot more. So I think there are inequities certainly from both sides.

Another thing they asked: Did this work? Were the schools pretty honest?

In the Ivy League, the schools were honest. They had a great deal of trust among each other. Yet the place in which you felt there was dishonesty was with the parents. We saw this happen so often. You would go into one home that was extremely modest, where the family had saved money and looked forward to the time when the son would be going to college and wanted him to go so much. They would fill out the form and lean over backwards to offer as much as they could.

In the same city I would go into another home where the family obviously had many advantages, but this father had a CPA or a lawyer fill out the form and actually received more aid. I have seen this happen many times. No matter what you do it will happen. There will be family dishonesty, no matter how honest the school may be. There will be inequity from both ends of it.

Chairman Flynn: There is one point I don't quite follow. I know there are inequities when a boy's family contribution is \$1500 and he can go to a \$1000 school and pay \$1000 and have \$500 in the bank, and when he goes to another school that costs \$4000 he would have to spend the \$1500. But when you say there are inequities because this school is going to give you more of a scholarship than the other, that I think presently exists.

In Texas you can use the same analogy. Texas is offering a \$1500 full grant, SMU is offering a \$3000 grant-in-aid. So that inequity exists today as much as it would under this legislation. But we do have to agree that inequity exists in the other direction.

Mr. Sawyer: I might add something here concerning the parents who have saved as opposed to those who have not. You notice nowhere are the parents asked to extract money from their savings. Everything is based on current income. We have not penalized the people who have saved for this purpose.

John E. Kane: (University of Arkansas): Everybody I have heard this afternoon agrees that there is a real need to control the expenses and one would indeed be a maverick to hold contrary. However, I do not believe any good purpose would be served by making the situation worse than it really is and perhaps causing us to take vociferous action or causing us to take a defensive attitude that perhaps is not fully justified.

I am unable to reconcile some of the statements in the report with the figures in the FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS. In the Committee's report, for example, the statement is made that a rapidly increasing number of athletic departments find themselves operating at a deficit.

On the other hand, Table 44 of the FINANCIAL ANALYSIS doesn't indicate this is true. If I understand this table correctly, the number of deficit schools between 1960 and 1969 increased from 94 to 116. This might seem a fairly rapid increase, but the number of profit schools also increased from 49 to 70. In other words, the sample went up from 143 to 196, so the percentage of deficit schools actually went down from 66 to 62.

I think I heard the comment this morning in the report of the Executive Committee that expenses are increasing far more rapidly than revenues. It might be interesting to make a comparison based on Table 43 of the FINANCIAL ANALYSIS.

Based on figures between 1960 and 1969, the expenses went up over the ten-year period by 108 per cent. The revenues went up almost as much, 104 per cent. There is really not much difference.

If we take a look at Table No. 43 in the FINANCIAL ANALYSIS it would seem that in the entire period there was no deterioration in the revenue-expense relationship in the Class A institutions, but there was deterioration in the Class B institutions, and the Class C institutions probably improved a little. There was deterioration in the Class

D, and very little deterioration in Class E. Over-all, there was very slight deterioration as my percentage figures earlier indicate.

Let me make reference to one other statement in the Committee's report. "The fact that a few athletic departments may be solvent is not a valid reason for ignoring the problem." Anybody would agree with this, but if in fact there are only a few athletic departments that are solvent this would not be a reason for ignoring the problem, but based on the study 40 per cent of the institutions are showing a profit, which is certainly not just a few institutions. If these figures are right it is not good to imply that there are only a few institutions that are solvent.

I don't think we ought to exaggerate the matter. I don't think we ought to put ourselves too much on the defensive. If universities are suffering financially, based on this report, I don't think it could be said this is primarily due to the deteriorating financial situation in athletics.

If there are important questions or reservations about the specific proposal, it seems to me the idea that college athletics is deteriorating badly, on the verge of a new crisis, doesn't seem to be supported by this study.

I suggest that we move slowly and cautiously, and not adopt a proposal if there is considerable likelihood that the drawbacks of the proposal will outweigh the advantages.

John Larsen (University of Southern California): Mr. Chairman, the success or failure of the limitation on financial aid hinges on the application that appears in Appendix IV.

First of all, in the certification the signatories give permission for the NCAA representatives to examine the individual tax return, if necessary. There has been in the past the consideration of a man's or a woman's individual tax return as the most confidential of confidential information. There has been great resistance to have the Internal Revenue Service open its income tax return files to investigatory agencies, let alone on a voluntary basis such as this.

Secondly, the use of the adjusted gross income figure from the individual income tax return is fraught with inequities. We may recall from the publicity given the 1969 Income Tax Reform Act, there are a number of special favoritisms, if you want to call it that, such as oil depletion allowances and inequities in the income tax return by Congress for their own purposes. The adjusted gross income is net after the deduction for property taxes and interest by the individual homeowner paying a mortgage and also paying the property taxes. The person who is renting, for example, has a comparable outlay of cash, but does not have the tax deduction available and presumably would have to pay more then toward the contribution for the student-athlete's cost.

Perhaps the Committee might consider a field test of this form, rather than adopting the form and then saying we all have to use it. I am not exactly certain how this may be done, but maybe some present student-athletes' parents might be asked on a confidential basis for their reaction to completing such a form.

Mr. Sawyer: The release at the bottom of the page, which gives authority to examine the income tax return, is in very common use throughout the one thousand or more institutions that now use the CSS need service and the ACT need service, as well as the 22 states

that require this. Every one of these applications has comparatively the same clause, so this is nothing new.

Tom Jacobs (University of California, Los Angeles): I have a question for the Committee which goes to the problem of equity for the student. There is today perhaps a greater generation gap than we have ever faced. There are many students who are anxious to get out from under any parental control.

In the ordinary administration of financial aid or scholarships, the financial officer has considerable latitude to take this into account. It is perfectly clear that this is not possible under the recruiting pressure when we are talking about scholarships based on athletic ability.

I would like to ask the Committee members whether they have actually determined by talking with financial officers of a variety of schools how many students are granted additional scholarship help because they in fact are at odds with their parents and cannot get the help at home. And what does the Committee suggest can be done to make equity for the student-athlete? I believe that most people in the room would say the student-athlete should not be disadvantaged because he is an athlete and that we ought to treat him at least as well as we treat students in general.

Mr. Sawyer: We have provision for a self-supporting student, and obviously such a student would become a self-supporting student if it were made clear that he under no circumstances could get any more support from his parents.

A self-supporting student's application or evaluation would be made on the basis of his income only in such case, and not on his parents'.

We go even further than that. For a married student, a couple, we give him one extra child, whether they have one or not. [Laughter]

Mr. Jacobs: That is perfectly true, but the facts are that the evaluation is based on the preceding year's income tax. But there are plenty of parents who would say, "You are now on your own." This can be taken account of perfectly well in the noncompetitive or relatively noncompetitive situation of an ordinary scholarship grant. It cannot be in the case of the highly competitive athletic grant.

Lamon MacDonald (University of New Mexico): I have for a number of years been dealing with need. Any time you deal with need, especially with a special interest group such as athletics, you are going to have problems, the first one being the independent student. Many, many parents will sign an affidavit of nonsupport for a student when his deduction is pointing to \$650 and he can receive a \$2000 or \$3000 scholarship with an affidavit for nonsupport.

We have found also many, many more students are getting married. Married students will receive aid from a given university rather than receiving it from parents, and they expect the university to pick up that load. So I am not sure how much money you are going to save.

There are, of course, many problems that a financial aid officer could point out. How would you determine the need of foreign students who would not have the same income basis as those in the United States? How do you treat Social Security benefits given to students and the G.I. Bill of Rights payments?

Edward Krause (Notre Dame University): This is a most confusing situation. I notice the coaches here talked about nothing but the need problem. I do not know how you are going to implement the need

formula. I don't believe the coaches would criticize the fact that we limited grants-in-aid as far as football is concerned, but even with this the Committee brought out in its report that the grants-in-aid are allowed—30 for schools that have a four-year program, and then an additional 30 for schools that have a five-year program. There is an inequity there.

I suggest very strongly that we eliminate the "redshirt" program which would help the financial situation around the country.

Secondly, I wonder if the Committee has looked into cutting down grants-in-aid for other sports. I recommend strongly to the Committee and to the organization that we forget the need plan and concern ourselves with a limit on grants-in-aid for all sports.

If we are trying to save money, why don't we make football and basketball players eligible in the freshman year? That would eliminate some financial problems. [Applause]

Chairman Flynn: The Committee felt that getting into the "redshirt" area would create more problems for us.

Our proposal requires all students receiving aid based on athletics to be on the need formula. Only the limitations apply to football and basketball. The need formula applies to all student-athletes, not just to football and basketball.

Duffy Daugherty (Michigan State University): I would like to applaud the Ivy League because they have great participation. I wish we could get as many out for football as the Ivy League schools. Obviously, they do not rely on gate receipts to finance their program. My figures may not be correct, but they banded around figures that the average Ivy League attendance this year was around 19,000 per game.

They were intelligent enough to have a freshman program, a junior varsity program, a 150-pound program and a varsity program. This is wonderful. It is unfair to compare the ill-fated attempt by the Big Ten to go on a need program with the Ivy League. It has been said that the Big Ten failed because we were an island surrounded by schools giving room and board and the Big Ten had to rely on the need factor.

I will just speak for Duffy Daugherty. I am not going to speak for Murray Warmath or Ara Parseghian who happened to be in the conference at that time. I never felt so much like a hypocrite as I did when this program was in effect in the Big Ten. Maybe I am less honest than a lot of the coaches. I am not going to quote them, but they all admitted to me privately they were cheating. The Big Ten program did not deteriorate under the need factor. It was just as strong then or stronger than it is right now. But we got away from it because we were all sick of being hypocrites. Let's be honest with one another.

When Commissioner Reed went to the faculty representatives in the Big Ten, and said our coaches had agreed if we could have a program that we could live by and recruit under in an honest way with our competitors we would give our word we would abide by it. I said, "If we have this kind of program, there will not be any more cheating."

I have never believed that a football coach doesn't know what his alumni are doing, except in some circles. I have never seen an alumnus yet who did anything for a kid that he didn't want the head coach to know about it. He wanted to be a big guy.

So we gave up the need program for one we thought honest and

workable. Of course, we have passed the statute of limitations [laughter], but I haven't cheated since.

I don't intend to quit, but I will promise you this: I will never coach again under a program that involves the need factor. I think I am as honest as most. All coaches want to be honest. You are putting all institutions in one category. I am not saying that they don't want to win as much as I do, but coaches at the smaller colleges do not have as much pressure as the 118 coaches in the major college football. There is a challenge to win, but our problems are not the same. It is a mistake to put them all in the same basket. You are talking about different problems.

At Michigan State we may have financial problems. In the last ten years we have never been lower than third in the nation in attendance and we have 13 or 14 sports. I am all for these sports, but I don't want to see football blamed exclusively for the rising cost. They haven't raised my salary that much. A lot of coaches are paid more than I am. I am not here to ask for a raise after the last few years we have had. [Laughter] I am not trying to be facetious, but it is time we stand up and be honest. Let's not use subterfuge. Enough of that goes on. Since the Big Ten gave up the need factor it has operated more honestly than ever before.

It never cost more than \$1100 to come to Michigan State at the time of the need program. Now it is \$1850. This is where you are raising the costs. We had something added to our budget last year that cost our athletic program \$250,000 in one fell swoop. We were only charged fees on in-state tuition. The state legislature said, "From now on you are going to pay out-of-state fees for your out-of-state students." So right away it cost one-quarter of a million dollars more. This has nothing to do with playing one platoon or two platoon, or using a need factor.

There are many things we need to go slowly on or at least delay until I get out of coaching, and I plan to coach until we have another national championship. [Laughter and applause]

Dick Clausen (University of Arizona): At one time I coached College Division football in a school where we did use the need principle for grants-in-aid. I honestly felt the biggest problem I had with the squad from time to time was the inequality of aid among the players. This caused a morale problem, particularly with your best players who would compare notes or find out what they are getting. Eddie Anderson, who was at Iowa at that time, told me he had the same problem there because they did not all get the same type of scholarship. From time to time, if your best players are on the field and getting less than the ones on the bench it causes a morale problem. I believe this should be considered.

Anthony Morella (American University): I feel that the Committee has done a commendable job and certainly the need factor should be considered, but in looking over the preliminary report it strikes me that devices planned to determine need are fraught with problems, for example, the utilization of the tax return, of principal sources of support, the certification of adjusted gross income, number of dependents. Could not the same thing be satisfied by simply attempting to secure an affidavit or some certification from the applicant as to

taxable income available to his principal source of support, be it his spouse, his mother or his father?

If you were compelled to verify one of these reports, the release simply asks for the tax return as filed from the sources of support. That, of course, need not be the tax return as accepted by the Internal Revenue Service, but simply the form filed, which could be considerably different in a span of three years.

An adjusted gross income as reported on a tax form, can be totally unreflective of the real income of the source of support, in that there are a number of ways and means to avoid reporting real income and there are a number of devices in arriving at adjusted gross income that severely sidetracks real income.

Perhaps the Committee could explain alternative methods which were considered and why this complicated utilization of the previous year's tax return seems to be the best area when to some of us it has many, many loopholes.

Mr. Sawyer: When I was asked to develop a formula for computing the expected family contribution, the instruction I got from the Committee was "KISS," Keep It Simple, Stupid.

We considered some of the existing systems. We felt they gave really more information than was needed. We realize that every time you simplify something you leave the possibility of a loophole, but we felt strongly that by oversimplifying we would gain better results for our central purpose over a period of time.

I am sure there will be inequities. There are in anything anyone does. There are inequities in the 1600 legislation. There are inequities in any rule. But we tried to balance inequities with what we felt would be the simplest for everyone involved, not the simplest for NCAA, but for the people filling out the form. They are the ones with whom we are concerned. We used the federal income tax return and adjusted gross income to make it easy for them. In a different form it would be very difficult and confusing to know just what type of income we needed.

Howard Grubbs (Southwest Athletic Conference): First let me say that all of us are in agreement with the objectives of this program and appreciate the work that the Committee has done in putting it together. There are several things omitted, in my judgment.

On the need program, no mention is made of loans. Would it be permissible for the youngster to be loaned money by the institution in order for him to pay his assessment? Would it be permissible for him to use government grants to pay this assessment?

It has been mentioned, but passed over with very little comment, that you are going to have more adjustment problems than you realize. I have the rather thankless task of being on a committee that has supervised the interconference letter-of-intent for the last six or seven years. This was in 125 or 130 institutions which took part in that program involving over 6000 signees who actually received financial aid.

I have no way of knowing—and certainly it is simply guessing on my part—but in this program you would have 40,000 or 50,000 youngsters who would like to go to these 700 schools. You will have a lot of applications that you will have to ignore and thereby create further inequities or you will have to investigate. The father is going to

lose his job. The investments that he has are going to be decreasing in their return. His grandmother is going to have to go to the hospital. There are 100 things that are going to happen to these people, and they are going to ask for relief. Many of them will be justified, and someone must go to each place to determine which ones are justified and which ones are not. When the word gets out that this can be done, then you will have twice that many the next year.

How about the youngster who has \$600 to pay, and his father says to the institution, "I am perfectly willing to pay the \$600, but I haven't got it right now. I will pay \$50 a month." This is done regularly for any student. He pays the first month and then he gets behind in his payments. At what time is the institution going to be required by the NCAA to run that youngster off? I know what will happen, and you know what will happen. If he runs fast, if he makes good grades and if he can catch the forward pass he will not be run off. [Laughter] If he is not doing well out there, they will tell the father he has to pay or the youngster will have to leave.

I personally—Frank Broyles won't agree with me—am in favor of limitations. But you cannot have exceptions in your limitations.

What about governmental grants? I am sure that some of these financial aid officers would certify that even though the boy was six foot nine he was only given the governmental grant because he was a needy youngster. They didn't take him because he was six foot nine.

The whole idea of limiting the scholarships will go down the drain unless you have an ironclad program without all these exceptions.

Chairman Flynn: The Committee said that four or five loans would be permitted.

In the case of the six-foot-nine boy, if you find any of them who have not been recruited, I wish you would send them to me. [Laughter]

I can see only two exceptions, namely, a boy who has not been recruited and is receiving non-athletic aid, or a boy who has been recruited and is not receiving aid. Those are the two exceptions.

Frank Williams (Utah State University): The coaches were very emphatic in their realization of the enormity of this problem under study right now.

If my memory serves me correctly, this body was organized to develop a program in athletics which would be suitable to the public which we serve. If there is subterfuge, and evidently there must be because it has been brought out several times by the coaches and others in this organization, let's study the possibilities. If the student-athlete receives more than the full grant that is allowed him, the athlete must report this. If he does not, he loses his aid or his eligibility to play. What is the coaching profession doing about this subterfuge if there is this subterfuge?

C. R. Gilstrap (University of Texas, Arlington): Much has been said about the Big Ten deserting its need program because it was on an island. Perhaps your Committee now feels it is on an island. I thought there would be more people speaking in favor of your proposal which has a great deal of merit. I would like to say some-

thing in favor of it, but I am having a little difficulty coming up with something at the moment. [Laughter]

Seriously, I think it is most unfortunate that Commissioner Reed could not be here today since he is the only member of the Committee who has experience in the need program. The entire group ought to hear from him on this subject, at some time that might be convenient for him.

John R. Davis (University of Nebraska): If it is the intention of the Council to hold another convention between now and next January, I ask that the Committee be instructed to come up with some alternatives. Such things as adding a dollar to the cost of a ticket hasn't been explored to my satisfaction in this whole process.

At Nebraska, if we didn't have a good program in athletics the university would be in deeper trouble than it is now. We are looking at institutional problems that are perhaps outside athletics, and I submit to you that I am not willing to accept the entire package of institutional problems as a part of the athletic community.

Alexander Durley (Prairie View A&M College): What does a boy mean when he tells me, "Coach, I am going to accept the best offer." I say, "We offer the NCAA allowed amount." If we answer this question honestly and truthfully you will cut out a lot of expenses.

George Bisacca (Fairfield University): In listening to the specific objections to the Committee's report, I think it has an impossible task. Our members do not have enough common denominators on financial resources and academic standards to be subjected to general legislation. We run the full gamut of private schools and public schools.

The success of the Ivy League in implementing the need program has been due to the fact that they have sufficient common denominators in all areas. They are all heavily endowed schools with the same economic standards and tuition costs. But when we talk about the gamut from Ivy League to struggling denominational schools and large state schools, it seems to me a logically impossible task to impose general legislation on people who have very little in common with each other.

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas): Are we trying to limit, to equate, or are we trying to cut costs? The coaches can pretty much defeat the idea that the limit of 30 will reduce costs drastically.

If you will sit down with the coaches, we can prove to you that you are not going to save much money, and certain schools are not going to save as much as others because they don't need as much.

When we recruit in the states of Texas, Arkansas and Oklahoma it is very competitive. There are very few boys because the population in that area does not equal what it is in Ohio. We have 15 institutions recruiting in the area and we cannot be as selective as Penn State with 1500 schools playing football. In our entire state we have 120, and of those only half a dozen have more than one coach.

The coaches feel the conference should set the limit. I am speaking for a certain group and we can prove what I said.

I recommend a cross-section of football coaches be appointed to the committee. The gentlemen on the Financial Aid Committee are all very respected in their particular schools, but a cross-section of the schools represented in this room today is not on that committee.

As the trustees of the American Football Coaches Association, we would like to be represented at each meeting to carry out our responsibility to the coaches who have to implement the things you might enact.

There is nothing you can come up with that hasn't been tried and found to have been loopholes. But you seem to pass by the inequities by saying, "Sure, there are inequities." When you are recruiting for top players there had better not be inequities.

The coaches association would like to be represented. There are only two men on the Committee who have been in the field. We would like to be represented at all meetings and give our views. We hope we can come up with something that will save college athletics. That is what we hope, whether we sound like it or not. We would like to help, if you will let us.

[The session adjourned at 4:45 p.m.]

COMBINED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES AND ATHLETIC DIRECTORS ROUND TABLE

Tuesday Morning, January 12, 1971

The session convened in Ballroom B at 10:05 a.m. with Robert W. Pritchard, District One vice-president and director of athletics at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, presiding.

Chairman Pritchard: Gentlemen, the NCAA is taking a leadership role in drug education. We hope that you will become vitally concerned and that you will also take part in whatever way you can in the crusade not only on your campuses, but in your communities. There is no problem other than war and peace which is greater than this one, and by all indications it is not abating.

First on the program is Dr. Hardin Jones, professor of medical physics and physiology at the University of California, Berkeley, and his topic will be "The Historical View of Drugs."

Dr. Hardin Jones (University of California, Berkeley): Let me give you a view of what drugs do before I talk about their historic importance and their historic effects. Drugs really take the place of some of the controls that are within the body. All of the drugs are physiologically active. They either take the place of hormones, and hormones are part of the controlling mechanism, or they take the part of some of the chemical messengers within the nervous system which are also in a sense hormones.

There are many of these special compounds highly related to the autonomic nervous system, and more than just involved in the sympathetic or parasympathetic system which is a crude addition to the nervous system, they range upward even into the level of consciousness. All drugs have multiple effects.

Now the most powerful drug that was known in the world until very recently was opium. Opium is a crude mixture of approximately ten alkaloids which are present in the juice of the poppy plant that coagulates in the sun and is collected. All attendant alkaloids have very remarkable properties because they all affect different parts of the brain and autonomic nervous system. The most powerful effect sought from opium was its ability to abolish pain, and associated with the abolition of pain was the ability to control inflammatory reaction and to quiet crude movements.

These colligative properties made opium the most sought after drug in the world and for most of the past three thousand years it was worth its weight in gold. As a matter of fact, it became the basis of commerce in the world over much of the past three hundred years, too, and it was so valued because of all the diseases that plague people. Opium is essentially a specific cure, not for the things that irritate the body, but for the logical circumstances that give rise to pain and flux.

In 1750, approximately, the Advance Guard of the British Government captured the emperor of India. Among his assets was the ancient

opium monopoly, and having acquired this they scaled up production because opium was very valuable.

In the year of our American independence, 1776, the British East India Company smuggled a thousand chests of opium into China. Until that time China had exercised very tight control over opium because it had past experience in drug crazes, but because of this smuggling by a foreign country the Chinese government officials were not able to cope with the problem. More than ten wars were fought over the question of smuggling opium into China, and the wars were fought by the Chinese government trying to defend itself. Opium use increased steadily in China, limited not by the rate of production but by the rate at which drug abuse was spread among the Chinese once a social pattern was set up to allow individuals to spread their drug addiction, and it increased steadily for 140 years.

China was the most advanced of all the countries in the world, certainly the largest, certainly the most industrious, certainly the most valued in terms of gross national product. One-third of the gross national product of China was sent abroad in the form of tea, ceramics, silk or firecrackers and, traded for nothing except opium, therefore, opium became the balance of trade. Most of the world doesn't know this.

The balance of trade in China by the turn of the century in relation to opium amounted to nearly a billion dollars a year. If you figure that the value of the dollar at that time was at least thirty times what it is today, the traffic in China was equivalent to about \$30 billion, and it was about a third of the Chinese gross national product.

This was what caused the demise of China. More than 100 million adults in China died in the early part of this century due to drug abuse, and the Chinese people have never recovered from the economic disaster that overtook them.

In this trade, by 1790, this wonderful drug that relieved all pain, all discomfort, all dejection and depression, anything you wanted to name including tuberculosis and dysentery, had a superficial effect, one that was so profound that people thought of it as the most sought-after medicine.

It was sold openly on the continent of Europe and in England and the United States beginning about 1790, when the traders had enough opium to bring back home. The first result was the drug epidemic in two universities, Oxford and Cambridge. We had such speakers at Cambridge at that time as Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Charles Lamb and DeQuincey. They started opium addiction among British literary intellectuals which has continued more or less down to the present day. There was a surprisingly large number of influential people who followed this route and had no other life except their essential involvement with opium and their literary commitment.

The world has read about Sherlock Holmes, but doesn't know for the most part that Sherlock Holmes was modeled after an opium-addict writer, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. Both Sherlock Holmes and Sir Arthur Conan Doyle used opium by hypodermic syringe and at times also used cocaine to fight withdrawal pains when opium was not available.

This is all in the first book of Sherlock Holmes which captured much of the middle-class world by storm in the 1880's, 1890's and at the turn of the century.

It was sufficiently commonplace in those circles so people didn't think too much about it. Some people didn't realize that Sherlock Holmes was a bachelor. As a matter of fact, he did not have any essential companionship at all, and neither did Sir Arthur Conan Doyle or the other literary intellectuals who followed this pattern. All their fanciful writing of poetry and essays, which have been accepted as some of the world's greatest imaginary writing, is so imaginary that no one can understand it. They were talking about their withdrawal symptoms and the fact they didn't have any sex life. They were in utter misery on account of it and yet they liked opium. This is the problem about drugs.

I have spent six intensive years studying drug literature. The one thing that all the drugs that are used for essential pleasure have in common—and in this I include alcohol, marijuana, LSD, the barbiturates, amphetamines, cocaine and opium, all of them together—is this: If you allow the milder drugs to be used in larger doses they can induce sensual disturbances in the pleasure centers of the brain directly which are just as disturbing as the stimulation of the brain by opium.

It is almost as though you reached inside your brain and tickled your pleasure centers. We don't know exactly where the pleasure centers are. They are mechanisms whereby we can charge up our emotions, and while the main cycle is related to sex, everything we do in life is somehow or other related to the senses—vision, hearing, taste, smell—and all the senses affect to some extent these pleasure centers to give us satisfaction or pain.

If you get these adjustments out of kilter by bypassing the senses, then there is a perversion of the mind so the mind cannot use these important functions.

Now to summarize in terms of what a very experienced drug user told me in a conversation. I give you this one example because this person is the key to putting it all in a nutshell, just as I could later show some of the English writers, in their mystic way, wrote about their personal problems.

This man said, "I am still a heroin addict."

I said, "A few minutes ago you told me you haven't used heroin for ten years."

"That is right. Every day is a struggle all over again so I won't use heroin."

"You are no longer having any withdrawal symptoms, isn't that true?"

"I haven't had any withdrawal symptoms for ten years, but I don't feel good inside and I miss the good feelings I used to have when I took heroin."

"Give me an example."

"You see outside the sun is shining. I know the sun is shining and I know if I go out in the sun it will even warm me and it is a lovely day outside, but I don't feel inside me that it is a fine day. I used to feel it is a fine day on a day like this, but I don't now. My food still tastes, but it used to taste good and it gave me a zest to eat delicious food. It is just food now. I cannot enjoy anything I smell. Really, you know, I am empty and I am incapable of being fulfilled."

He was talking about the total aspects of sensuality in this analysis

he was giving me. I said, "You also include your sexual sensuality in that statement?"

"Yes. I can on occasion get some sexual function, but it is not worthwhile because it doesn't feel the same way to me that it used to feel before I took heroin."

This is the problem of drug addiction, except you have to be careful how you make comparison among drugs. The mildest drug is marijuana, and the most powerful drugs are the opiates of which there are a number that can be used more or less with equal effect. But there are people with just as much sensual absence or sensual perversion from using the hemp drugs, such as marijuana. If they have followed the regular pattern that we see in the Middle Eastern countries they will go to higher and higher dosages.

An expert on drug problems in the Middle East said he never saw a marijuana user in Athens who didn't give a history of upgrading the dose of marijuana during his lifetime. At least half the people who use marijuana graduate to fairly large doses of hashish, sufficiently large that the immediate pleasure sensations are completely bypassed because the sensory endings of the body as a whole are pretty much narcotized so they can't feel a thing. They are stoned.

Marijuana has some very remarkable properties. Of all the sensual drugs that one can take abusively, marijuana has accumulative effects, and the effect builds up over a period of several months and the maximum comes in more rapidly if the dose is large and more slowly if the dose is small. This gives the marijuana user the notion that the effect of marijuana holds, but after the maximum effect is built up, like all other drugs, the pleasurable sensation fades. Nevertheless, after a year or so users are not getting nearly the effect with the same dose. As a matter of fact, most marijuana users would have in the first year scaled up from using marijuana that is pretty weak to using the so-called Cadillac of marijuana that can only be done by some discrimination in the sale of the drug.

There is a transfer mechanism in this country where so many other drugs that can induce pleasure are available. The marijuana users do not siphon very much to the heavy doses of hashish in countries where marijuana is the cheapest drug available. Economics isn't a limiting factor until you get to opium, so the transfer that occurs in upgrading those in this country is one of transfer from marijuana to the amphetamines and the barbituates, to LSD and to heroin.

The drug craze was started through the writing of a British intellectual who was one of the most effective writers in the modern world. Aldous Huxley, who died recently, was a drug user most of his life. Shortly before his death, he wrote an essay called, "The Doors of Perception." Many millions of copies have been sold to the youth of the world and it called on them to follow his pathway to have mind-stretching experiences through the use of hallucinogenic drugs. The ones he recommended were psilocybin and methedrine, although he also used some marijuana. The drug users have taken this as gospel, that this is the way to become original; this is the way to become imaginative; this is the way to become creative; this is the way you stimulate your senses, and this is the way you can understand yourself. It is a bunch of hokum.

Huxley was teamed up for some of the writing and public propa-

ganda in this country with Allen Ginsberg and Timothy Leary in the latter's book, "The High Priest." They were putting Harvard University graduate students on psilocybin to induce them into the sexual parties in Leary's home. Leary was kind of ambidextrous, at least for a while.

This drug craze broke into the open in Berkeley in the aftermath of the free speech revolution in January, 1965, and we went from almost no drug users on college campuses to an estimated 15 million marijuana users. Out of these ranks have grown over the past few years three million who have had experience with amphetamines and LSD and at least 100,000 who have already transferred to heroin. The number of heroin users in the country is probably close to half a million by this time, and the evidence is that it all started with marijuana.

The only way we can stop the present drug craze, in my opinion—and in part it has been somewhat arrested—is to get the total public involved in understanding the hazard. Our drug craze over the last six years has been galloping at the rate of extension of seven per cent per month. The drug craze in China only ran at the rate of six per cent for a year. We have been running at the rate of seven per cent per month, which is fifteen times faster. Otherwise the mechanism is the same. One drug user tries to get another in his circle to use drugs. That is why the growth rate is astronomical.

To turn it off we have to change the climate, and you gentlemen can use your influence, because on each of your campuses and in each circle of young people you can in a very large measure set the tone and supply important facts that can turn this around. After all, we are in the business of building minds and bodies for a long life ahead. In stark contrast to our sales appeal here is something that not only will damage the mind, but will make the body incapable of being gratified forever. That is what the young are playing with, thinking they are going to stimulate the mind and grow in imagination. Thank you. [Applause]

Chairman Pritchard: We have another view of the problem from Frederick M. Garfield, assistant director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in Washington, D. C. His topic is "The Current Drug Problem in the United States." [Applause]

Frederick M. Garfield (Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs): One expert has said that the drug testing program invoked by the International Olympic Committee at Mexico City served to publicize an undeserved credibility of advantage from drug taking to millions of young and impressionable sports participants.

The use of drugs by athletes is certainly not new and did not stem from the action taken by the Olympic Committee. Bill Gilbert, in a series of articles in *SPORTS ILLUSTRATED* in mid-1969, cited numerous examples of drug use among amateur as well as professional athletes. He made a very pertinent observation in one of the articles that "... while the amount and kinds of drugs used in sports are impressive, the important difference between athletic and non-athletic drug use comes down to a matter of motive. An athlete takes—or is given by his supervisors, medical and otherwise—many drugs that he would not take or be given if he were not an athlete. And the rationale for much athletic drug use is unique, for the drugs are not taken either with the intention or effect of improving or maintaining health, or to

achieve a pleasurable sensation, but rather because the athlete or those around him believe he will perform better drugged than undrugged."

Thus, for most athletes, the drugs used are to cure, to control or to comfort such as pain-killers, tranquilizers, anti-inflammants and muscle relaxers; or to improve performance such as the stimulants, amphetamine and methamphetamine; or to gain weight, to accelerate growth or to improve well-being such as the androgenic-anabolic steroids. As an extracurricular activity, the amateur athlete who is also a student may get involved in the use of hallucinogenic drugs such as marijuana, LSD, STP, DMT and even the opiates.

I know of no survey specifically directed to nonmedical drug use among athletes. But many surveys have been conducted, mainly in educational institutions, to measure student use of drugs. Colleges and universities surveyed were for the most part located in large metropolitan areas on the east and west coasts. Junior and senior high schools, where drug use problems resulted in surveys, were also located in highly populated areas where drugs were readily available. The variety of questionnaires were rather haphazard in design and tended not to distinguish past from current drug use. At the present time, few statistics concerning the extent of narcotics use are available. The main source of such statistics is police arrest records.

Despite the shortcomings of the numerous drug use surveys, the findings do provide some indicators. Within any given year the drug use ratio among student populations shows a range of variation for different drugs. Marijuana use is on the increase for both university and high school students. For example, three surveys at a mid-Atlantic university indicate that marijuana increased from 15 per cent in 1967 to 24 per cent in 1968 to about 36 per cent in 1969. In two west coast high school surveys, 40 per cent of students reported marijuana use in 1969 compared with 32 per cent in 1968. The greatest college level use detected to our knowledge was 44 per cent and the highest secondary use was 40 per cent.

LSD, the amphetamines, barbiturates and opiates all show increasing rates of use on college campuses. Amphetamine use appears to be increasing somewhat among secondary school students as well. The greatest LSD use at the college level found was eight per cent and at the high school level, surprisingly, 15 per cent. For amphetamines, the highest use was 25 per cent at the college level and 21 per cent at the secondary school level.

Narcotics appear to be used by few students, although there is evidence of increasing use. The exception to this generalization is a 1969 study at a large north central university which indicates that 17 per cent of students reported "having ever" used opiates. The frequency of use breakdown reveals, however, that more than 16 per cent had used opiates only once or seldom and less than one per cent had used these substances often or regularly. The most concentrated use of narcotic drugs occurs among persons living in the inner cities. Here the juvenile drug user comes from "the most underprivileged, crowded and dilapidated areas" and even within these areas, drug use occurs where income and education are lowest and where there is the greatest breakdown of normal family living arrangements.

For marijuana, most students who have "ever" used the drug have done so more than once and about the same proportion of users report

frequent or regular use as those who report one time use.

For LSD and other hallucinogens, the proportion of users decreases as frequency of use increases.

For amphetamines, use is second only to marijuana, but well below rates of marijuana use. The proportion of users decreases drastically as frequency of use increases. For the barbiturates and tranquilizers, only a few persons use these drugs without prescription on a frequent or regular basis.

More than one drug use is common. Users of illicit drugs also have experience with tobacco and alcohol.

On the whole, illicit drug use occurs more frequently among men than among women in all drug categories and is higher among the college population than among working youth. Drug use is related to availability of drugs, location of institutions, social and demographic characteristics of students, difference in life styles at various institutions and disciplinary measures enforced by school administrators.

There is one bright hope in all these surveys—the majority of our youth are still not caught up in the drug syndrome. On the dark side, the drug problem is increasing and with it the danger of acceptance of the philosophy that promotes drugs as an escape and an alternative.

We have reached a point where it may be possible through the efforts of many concerned with the drug problem to begin collaboration in a sensible approach to the management and control of drug abuse. We must assume the obligation of exchanging facts and calling upon a wide range of talented persons to help shape our use of drugs to one of sensible discrimination and proportions.

For the NCAA, which has apparently not established policies on drug use, there is a need to delineate the drug problems which it faces and attempt to develop some common definitions and goals. These definitions and goals must then be developed into constructive programs that will allow proper and acceptable use of drugs by supervisory and medical personnel and discourage use by individuals who may not be aware of the dangers involved or by those who demonstrate their inability to use drugs wisely. There is need to consider educational approaches and the need to carry the policies and goals and programs to athletic directors at the secondary school level.

Given the increase in the problem among athletes, it may be appropriate to encourage high school and college athletic directors and coaches to develop drug abuse prevention programs. We are at the point in the problem where positive action is needed, rather than rhetoric.

A comprehensive set of guidelines for all those who direct youth in athletics is desirable and may be within the scope of the NCAA's concern. This might apply to little league directors and coaches, as well as school personnel.

We are very anxious to make young people aware of the consequences to their health of abuse of any drug for whatever purpose. If the NCAA can stimulate its members to take affirmative action in this area it will be a valuable service to the youth of our nation.

As leaders, the Association members must reach young people at their own level with a message that makes sense to them. They must try to restore and emphasize some established and tested values—family cohesiveness and intra-family communication. They must pro-

vide sound educational information on drug effects and move to de-glamorize drug use. There must be a basic reorientation of attitudes on the use of medications and elimination of the tendency to "take something" to relieve pain, vague distress or tension.

There is a need to understand the etiology of drug use in terms of the individual and in terms of a society undergoing rapid social change. But even more, there is a need to discover the social and psychological consequences of drug use on the user, the resulting relationships between the drug user and persons with whom he interacts, and finally, the consequences of drug use for the larger society. Thank you. [Applause]

Chairman Pritchard: The next and last panelist is Dr. Donald L. Cooper of the Oklahoma State University Hospital and Clinic. He is also the team physician and is very closely connected with the NCAA as chairman of the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. Dr. Cooper was the team physician for the 1968 Olympics. His topic is "The Athlete and Drugs."

Dr. Donald L. Cooper (Oklahoma State University): I am sorry Dr. Jones wasn't able to be here last night for our reception. I obviously have been with him for the last three days, but he had to fly to California and fly back, and he was up in the fog here at five o'clock in the morning. I admire his persistence in trying to get here.

The thing I feel so bad about is there was a little girl—pardon me, she was a young lady, a woman—in a white dress last night at the reception, which titillated the hell out of my pleasure centers, and if there is a man here who didn't feel that last night at the reception my sympathy is extended to him. I tell you, it was almost ludicrous. I just followed the thing around. ([Laughter] You know, if there had been nothing else here, it would have been worthwhile for me to get the concept about drugs and the titillation of the sexual area of what we call the pleasure center in the brain.

I was just old-fashioned enough and fortunately still young enough to fantastically enjoy that particular sexual expression, and it would literally scare the hell out of me to think there would be anything interfering with it or if I had stopped messing around with the stuff I couldn't get it back. [Laughter]

You know, this whole area of ergogenic aids and drugs has always fascinated me. I don't know of any particular group of people who are fascinated more than the people in athletics. We human beings are notoriously on the prowl for that particular gimmick or that easy way or that "special something extra." There are no shortcuts to excellent performance, but I guess it is the nature of the beast to keep striving to find some help.

Our imagination can really be challenged when we look at the definition of the word, ergogenic. This is a term we use in relation to athletes. It is very short and very unlimited. According to Dorland's Medical Dictionary, it is defined simply as "anything tending to increase work output." All of us have seen coaches using their own specific technique of "increasing the work output" of their particular charges, whether they be football players, swimmers, baseballers, basketballers, tracksters, wrestlers, or any other athlete. Undoubtedly there are many, many forms of "psychological ergogenic aids" being

used by almost all coaches in one form or another, that are probably very safe and actually very valuable.

I point out the broader limits of the definition only to help you realize that there are many shady areas when we talk about ergogenic aids and drugs and that far from being a clear black and white situation, the more we delve into it, the more complicated it can become.

In the past few years I have read literally dozens of papers, some of them grossly unscientific, from this country and from Europe, and it is interesting to note the many conflicting reports and the many very unscientific approaches being taken in evaluating the various specific agents and drugs that can be considered ergogenic aids.

One of the reasons is that the coach and the athlete, have a greater tendency to project to the doctor, the scientist or the researcher far more knowledge than they really have. Being human beings, most doctors like this. It is fun to play a little god, you know. Of course, this gets to the point of misinterpretation. People can see one thing and misinterpret it.

It is like the people who had three little boys. They were greatly concerned about these little boys. They were healthy kids, but they kept using foul language all the time. They didn't know what to do about it, and being good parents they went to the local child psychiatrist and said, "What are we going to do about our children who use this filthy language?"

The psychiatrist said, "It is very simple, just knock the hell out of them."

So the next morning Johnny walked into the kitchen and his mother said, "Johnny, what will you have for breakfast?"

Johnny said, "Oh, give me some of those . . . corn flakes." Pow! [Slapping]

Then Billy walked into the kitchen, and his mother said, "Billy, what will you have for breakfast?"

Billy said, "Oh, give me some of those . . . corn flakes." Pow!

Then came George. George walked into the kitchen and his mother said, "George, what will you have?"

George said, "You can be damned sure it ain't going to be corn flakes." [Laughter]

So you see different people have different ways of interpreting. That kid was getting the message, but it wasn't the right message.

That is oftentimes the way it is with people who do research in drugs and vitamins and proteins and various stuff in the business of athletics. They see something take place per se, but they interpret it entirely wrong.

In general, it is the chemical compounds or drugs most of us think about when we hear the word ergogenic. In a sense, the British are a great deal more prudish and hardnosed about any chemical substances being used. They call it "doping." By their definition, the use of any chemical substance not present normally in the human body and not playing an essential role in a healthy person competing in athletics is doping. In this definition of doping even the use of aspirin for a headache, or the use of anti-acids for a hyperacidic stomach might be considered doping. In our drug-oriented society the one group that is really having fun with ergogenic aids are the horse racing people.

In 1968, they had a Kentucky Derby. Now if that race had been run in Colorado there would have been no problem because the Colorado interpretation is that phenylbutazolidin is a therapeutic drug, not a stimulator. Many people have the mistaken concept that the horse-racing people have on this whole subject. They don't know what they are doing. There is a lot of disagreement.

I happen to be on a campus where there is a veterinary medical school. One of my good friends used to work with race horses in Kentucky so we got all the literature on this. I kept looking for the answer to athletes and stimulating drugs, but there are no easy answers in any of these fields.

As I mentioned, we are a drug-oriented society, and if you have any doubts about it just watch your television screen a few hours. Our kids are being continually shown that drugs or chemicals can relieve their tension, calm their stomach, stop their aches and pains, help them sleep, wake them up, improve their personality, help their looks and complexion, increase their joy in life and on and on. In other words, the concept of better living through chemistry. We do see many fringe areas where it has certainly gotten out of hand. I don't know of any work yet on LSD and marijuana being used on athletes, but I would be willing to bet you without fear of equivocation that many of our athletes have been experimenting with some of these substances on the campus just as the other students on our campuses are doing.

I may be drifting a little from my primary assignment, but I feel it is important that we start being as aware of what is going on around us, and that we should be as honest with ourselves as we can in the hope that it will help us figure out where we are going in the future.

For a more practical approach and definition of substance misuse we probably should refer to the ruling of the International Amateur Athletic Federation. No agent that stimulates muscle and nerves should be used, no agent which paralyzes the sense of fatigue should be used and no agent which is habit forming should be used. When we tried to define what agents and drugs do specifically and what they will not do we found an awful lot of unanswerable questions.

Every human being is unique in himself. There are no two of us who have fingerprints alike. There are no two actual chemical setups that are exactly the same. You will find minute variations. What will respond in one person may not respond in another person. This is one of the things that makes it so terribly complicated.

When I was a sophomore in medical school taking biochemistry I was such an eager little kid. I wanted to pursue this great knowledge. I was at the University of Kansas and I had a professor of biochemistry well recognized throughout the country. I said to him in one class in a very sincere manner, "Tell me how aspirin works."

He said, "We don't know how aspirin works."

I haven't been out of medical school that long. That was back in 1949 or 1950, but until the last six years we had not a concept of how aspirin worked. There is a theory now that aspirin works by binding the copper iron within the cell and out of the cell and in the exterior phase and returning it to the cell, and this is how it reduces fever. We have known for years that aspirin reduces fever, that it relieves pain and that it is effective, but how it did it we haven't known. It is still just theory, nobody can actually prove how aspirin works.

Of course, I don't really believe any coach wants to harm any of his charges, yet all coaches would like to possess that little magic key to having all of the squad perform at their optimum at all contests.

I would like to summarize quickly these various classes of substances or agents that could be or have been considered ergogenic aids. Some general organization is essential and I feel this can best be done by listing fairly large categories that include several types of agents.

The categories are:

1. Physical and mechanical ergogenic aids.
2. Nutritional ergogenic aids.
3. Pharmacological ergogenic aids (drugs).
4. Psychological ergogenic aids.

Among the physical and mechanical ergogenic aids, one of the most common used to increase work potential is oxygen. This really got started—so many times in athletics you see people put 2 and 2 together and get 5—in the 1932 Olympics when the Japanese swim team had some great swimmers, but also each time in Los Angeles before they started swimming they were given oxygen. Of course the altitude was no excuse or no reason. It was later shown that three or four large hyperventilated breaths of normal air can help the individual swimmer just as much as oxygen. If one inhales oxygen prior to an event it has been fairly shown that it has no effect on work performance, speed, running ability or rate of recovery. If, however, oxygen can be given during the exercise period itself workloads can be maintained for longer periods of time. But it has to be a continuous intake of oxygen. It is here we get into one of the grey areas.

I might add that, of course, the Japanese had some damned good swimmers there, and that is all you are supposed to have. No matter what you do in athletics if you have some damned good athletes it is probably going to make you look pretty good. If you have a bunch of clunkers I don't care what you do, you are going to look pretty bad. It boils down to something that simple.

We play at Boulder, Colorado, and when you get into the higher altitudes many coaches will insist on having oxygen at the sideline. Again the best scientific data shows that it is of very little value, because oxygen cannot be stored and the increased oxygen cannot last more than two minutes, or possibly three at the most. A person would have to breathe it all the time, and you can't strap an oxygen tank on the back of an athlete, he has enough problems of his own without that. There, of course, may be some psychological help. And who is to say that this is necessarily all bad? The power of suggestion is fantastic.

Exposure to ultra-violet rays is felt by some to be beneficial and create a greater feeling of well being, but certainly there is no scientific evidence for it at all.

The use of negative ionization has been investigated and I have heard that negative ionization equipment has been installed in some dressing rooms. In two studies that were fairly scientific, no evidence of increased ability or strength was shown, but some researchers felt the sense of well being might be increased.

Massage could be considered a mechanical form of ergogenic aid and it has been shown to speed recovery from fatigue. The old-

fashioned trainer was a massager. I was a trainer for seven years before I went into the medical field. It was back in the days when you rubbed, and all I had was a heat lamp. It is amazing what happened. Of course, things have become so sophisticated that they now have five or six people doing each of these jobs now and probably much better.

With the track boys I had to do a lot of rubbing, and it was hard work, but this was shown to help speed recovery from fatigue, particularly if you have a boy doubling back in another race. There is no evidence of any increased strength or any increased speed or any increased performance as a result of massage.

Exercise rituals have to be considered mechanical ergogenic aids and there are all types and descriptions available. Some are fine. We have to do everything we can to try to increase work output. Isometrics, isotonics, weight lifting and exercise stations all increase strength and possible work capacity in a direct relationship to the amount of hard demanding and persistent work done by the athlete involved. A good conditioning program and varied training program is certainly the best ergogenic aid known to date. No one would object to this. To a degree this is what it's all about.

Nutritional ergogenic aids are many and fascinating. Probably no area has gotten so much attention as this one. When Herb Elliott was eating oats and seaweed, every aspiring track star in the world was trying to choke down the same crop. Herb Elliott was also working darned hard. He ran a lot through sand, uphill, and he put out a tremendous amount of effort. Of course, he ate a lot of good, normal, wholesome food, well balanced, also.

Protein and amino acid supplements are being pushed now. This has been going on for years, but most scientific evidence seems to show that a well-balanced diet will supply all of the protein and essential amino acids necessary. Of course, an athlete working hard may be taking in five or six thousand calories a day. You in your sedentary occupation as an athletic director or faculty representative probably should take in no more than 2500.

The guy who takes the regular food on the training table is probably going to be all right. There are a lot of high school kids who don't eat a proper diet. I have heard it said that we probably have the most overfed, undernourished teenagers in the world. But the guy who eats what is on the training table is going to be all right.

The high protein diet, rather than being of benefit, can be considered detrimental. The mere handling of the protein in your body, taking it through the stomach, through the intestinal tract, through the liver and breaking it down takes five percent more oxygen. A persistent diet in protein has been shown by research in Sweden involving cross-country skiers to be a detrimental factor. The skiers did much better on a high carbohydrate diet than a high protein diet.

If I tried to determine the worst thing to feed my basketball team, the worst thing to feed my football team before they play, it would be protein, steak and eggs. How many teams still eat steak and eggs before they play? It is ludicrous, but that is the way it is. We don't change easily. We stick to these old theories beginning way back in Greece. A trainer named Goldie had a stable full of real studs, he really had the athletes. He would go out and beat the hell out of

everybody. He said, "If they use muscles, let's feed them muscles," so he fed them red meat and they still beat everybody because they were such good athletes. From that time on, even to this day, people have had that interpretation. Actually, protein is to be avoided in the pre-game meal.

There are lots of salesmen in this world, and the only way they can make a living is to sell, so you are constantly going to be exposed to them. I suppose this is a gullible group of people. There is only one group of people more gullible than coaches, and that is doctors. You know when a guy starts out with a portfolio to sell a bunch of false stock he doesn't go to the banker or anybody like that or the business people; he goes to the doctors because the truth is the doctors as a group are the dumbest business men in America. But right behind the doctor in terms of gullibility in terms of buying stuff, watch the coach in the athletic department. He will buy more crap that has less use. It is a fantastic phenomenon. You will find all kinds of wild claims, especially in the area of nutrition.

All the scientific evidence seems to show that vitamins are being overrated. You know, Americans put out the most expensive urine in the world. [Laughter] Athletes put out even more expensive urine. It is a beautiful bright yellow and it is loaded with excreted vitamins.

Again, a well-balanced diet, and most training tables have it, with fresh, well-prepared food, will supply all the vitamins really necessary. If you can accept the fact that many of these nutritional substances may work psychologically, and certainly if not overdone can cause no harm, then there is not much to get on a soap box about. I don't feel it is so terrible to use any and all forms of psychology, just so long as you do not get the idea that this is a proven scientific fact. Don't start kidding yourself as to the physiological scientific importance of the various nutritional ergogenic aids.

Wrestling is a pretty good sport in Oklahoma State. These boys actually have to keep their caloric intake down and not eat so much as the other kids, and I do supplement their diets with a few vitamins. Maybe in my own mind for a psychological purpose and maybe in their mind for a psychological purpose. It is a one-a-day vitamin and I don't overload. You know the thing that happens is that one athlete says, "Hell, if one a day is good, ten ought to be ten times better." This is a false solution.

The most needed elements besides a well-balanced diet, are water and salt. They are needed in hot weather for increased energy output, comfort and even as protection for life itself. You can't afford to use solutions for water. Yet we find coaches, especially in high schools, who pride themselves on their spartan practice of allowing no water during practices, no matter what the weather conditions. It is a real sad commentary on our ability to communicate and get through to people.

Wheat germ should certainly be mentioned as it has recurrently been used in so many ways by athletes. The reports are very conflicting and one would have to admit that it just is not known whether or not certain people might or might not benefit. One could state that no harm has ever been done with a moderate amount of wheat germ so I see no reason to use it, probably far more for psychological than

physiological reasons. There is very little well controlled work that would lend any support to its value.

One of the things that one of my medical school professors used to tell me, "If you don't know what the hell you are doing at least don't do any harm." This is one of the things I follow in athletics; I try not to do any harm.

There are numerous other nutritional and mineral substances that have been used and I will only mention them in passing to state that they are readily supplied by a normal adequate diet and need not be supplemented. Potassium is important. Potassium dehydration can occur. This is the reason grape juice and grapefruit should be available in any diet for athletes or any diet program because it does supply potassium. Potassium is pretty important for regulating the heart.

Calcium, magnesium, phosphorus, lecithin, phosphates, sodium citrate and bicarbonate (alkalinizing agents) aspartic acid, coffee, tea, coke, gelatin, Gatorade and Take 5 are fine. I have no objection to them, especially the ones with potassium in them.

There has been a lot of research done in Europe on vitamin E. Vitamin E is somehow related to the oxygen exchange at the cellular level. I don't think the final word is in yet. Probably if it is used moderately it will do no harm, but there is no evidence of any great superiority.

One substance that has been used for years as a nutritional ergogenic aid and is still undergoing much study is honey. It appears in some work that the fructose sugar of honey does not burn out as rapidly as regular glucose, but many coaches in many areas use honey as a pre-game food. Honey is a carbohydrate food and certainly can do no harm.

The most dangerous and potentially harmful problem area is pharmacological ergogenic aids or drugs. As you know this list can be quite formidable and certainly too long to go into in any detail.

Certain of the more prevalent ones should be mentioned, such as the amphetamine family, because in some areas they are still being used. Unfortunately, they are not only being used by some of our athletes, but also many students are finding themselves hooked on this potentially dangerous habit-forming drug menace. You know the first deaths were reported back in 1880 from the side effects of using amphetamines.

From a scientific point of view, the papers are again in conflict, but there are some fairly valid papers showing that in the solo type athletic activities amphetamines apparently can increase performance a little bit. However, many studies show that in complicated problem-solving sports and tests such as football and basketball, where you have to make relatively intelligent decisions very quickly there is impairment of the person's ability to solve the more difficult problems. So subjectively, apparently there is stimulation of pleasure centers and the person thinks he is really doing well. Most people who are on amphetamines say, "I really have to have it because it makes me do so much better." But this is an illusion, this is a hoax, this is a self-deception.

Because of the very real potential habituation and addiction problems the amphetamines must be condemned. They also have an ad-

verse effect on pulse and respiratory recovery time. There have been many central nervous system stimulants and depressants, heart stimulants, muscle stimulants and respiratory stimulants tried in athletics.

I was talking to Ozzie Nelson last night and he told me that in 1924, 1925 and 1926 when he was playing his coach used to give him a little tiny dose of strychnine. That isn't particularly new. This was for a stimulant.

A partial list would include caffeine, camphor, cocaine, tranquilizers, coramine, strychnine, metrazol, digitalis, roncal, ephedrine, nicotine, nitroglycerin, alcohol, benzedrine, epinephrine, nitrites, cytochrome C, thiocyanate, veratrum alkaloids, rauwolfia, hydralazine and thyroid extract. I don't think there is anything in the world that some athlete hasn't tried to see if it didn't make him better.

Special mention needs to be made of the androgenic-anabolic steroids which are used by the tall slim lineman who wants to be a tall wide lineman. There are 18 steroid hormones in the human body. They are so interrelated to each other that when you throw an artificial or a substitute chemical hormone into a person who doesn't need it there is no way to predict the total effect over several years.

Randy Matson is an example. Randy used them several years ago, but when his weight got up he didn't throw as well. Randy used them less than a year and was not using them when he made his record. No one has put the shot as far as Randy Matson. Randy told me that when he got too big he lost speed. Of course, he was a big guy to begin with.

This one fellow who used these substances was trying to impregnate his wife and he had a very low sperm count and low fertility. There are things we need to know about these drugs. We don't know the total effect, the long-term effect. Liver damage has occurred. There is a chemical hepatitis that can occur in some people. Why only some, I don't know.

It is like poison ivy. You can go along for years and never break out with poison ivy. All of a sudden you walk by it on the golf course and get it. No one knows what happens with people when this occurs.

Prostatic hypertrophy has occurred. A fellow 25 years old had a transurethral resection. This isn't supposed to happen until you are 75 or 80.

A well controlled study at UCLA seemed to show no increase in muscle strength or quickness, and that the increased weight was due to fluid retention, as the hormones do change the fluid retention. You cannot avoid the androgenic effects with any of the so-called anabolic steroids. We mention all of these names to condemn them. Do not allow yourselves to be conned by some well-intentioned alumni or over-enthusiastic coach to get mixed up in the drug business.

The fourth ergogenic aid is psychological. Hypnosis and other things have been tried.

The human animal is by far the most suggestible animal around, and can be so easily influenced by those around him, whether he is the coach, the trainer or the team physician. Of course, it is terribly important that you have an optimistic outlook. If you have a pessimistic attitude about the outcome or about your ability it affects you as an athlete.

It is very complicated and very expensive to test athletes for drug

use, but when it was done in France and Italy during cycling races and at Winnipeg, more losers were using drugs than winners were.

The policy of testing the winners is dumb. If you test, you ought to test everybody. They had some first, second and third place winners thrown out. Then they gave the medals to the fourth, fifth and sixth place winners, but they didn't test them.

When you test, you should test everybody who participates. For instance, in Winnipeg none of the first eighteen had used any drugs, but from there they picked up eight different individuals who had used drugs.

In Italy none of the first 11 finishers had used any drugs.

Of course, what happens here is the loser, who knows he hasn't been working hard, who knows he has been goofing off, who knows he hasn't been putting out, is looking for that extra something more than the guy who has trained hard.

We have tried to cover a very vast and really poorly explored area in a very short time. But don't forget that a good sound coach, an interested and sincere trainer, a conscientious and concerned team physician, all communicating well, including the athletic director, can be a real ergogenic aid to any athlete or group of athletes. The athletes know who is sincere and who is not. They also should know that hard work, sweat, tears and sacrifice are necessary to produce the winning results they want. A good training and conditioning program is still the safest and best ergogenic aid. Thank you. [Applause]

Dick Watts (University of Maryland, Baltimore County): Dr. Jones, you included alcohol as one of the products that pervert the senses. How can I, as a parent, as a coach, and as an administrator, justify the legal use of alcohol and not justify the use of these other products?

Dr. Jones: Alcohol is a fairly powerful drug, and probably the world over it produces about as much misery as anything else. Most people use alcohol to relax. Alcohol works on the inner part of the brain, the so-called autonomic part. You can be taught to relax in about ten minutes. You just take an ounce of alcohol and sit down and the nervous system changes your mood.

You can do that very same thing if you have learned the method for turning the mind on and making the mind work for you. But most people don't do that, and I find it is primarily why people drink.

As a physiologist, I can tell you the mind starts out in the morning scarcely awake, and it works harder and harder all day long if you are pretty hard-driven, and at the end of the day you want that mind to calm down and be on vacation when you get home. This is primarily what drives our culture to alcohol.

Now, alcohol has some other side effects. If we could just use alcohol this way there wouldn't be much to worry about because it doesn't do much in the way of harm, it doesn't do much in the way of disturbing the thought pattern, except it slows everything down. It is the cause of most automobile accidents because anyone using alcohol has a little bit of the time factor taken away from him, and that is all the margin of safety there is in a tight situation.

In regard to the often-asked question, "Why is it that society accepts alcohol and why is it that society is attempting to reject some of the other drugs that can stand in for alcohol," it can be shown that you can create much greater problems with them. In regard to the

immediate substitute for alcohol, the drug family, the barbiturates, the sleeping tablets, individuals who are addicted to barbiturates have a really hellish time. They not only have sensory deprivations that are more serious than with alcohol, but they have all the more severe problems of the alcoholics, plus even more difficult withdrawal symptoms. You can get withdrawal symptoms from alcohol if you are an alcoholic. The AA group knows this quite well.

I will say one thing for alcohol. The moderate use of alcohol does not cause hallucinations, according to my definition of hallucination, which is mental confusion. Those who use marijuana always hallucinate. The big difference is that marijuana users do not have any mechanical coordination difficulties with acute exposure to marijuana. The drunk never can quite get anywhere he wants to go. He falls flat on his face. But the marijuana user can be completely intoxicated with regard to judgment and sensory evaluation and yet carry out his hallucinations and his deluded inclinations. The alcoholic at least is a little bit protected by not being able to carry through mechanically. Otherwise, I don't see much difference.

With regard to all the drugs that can be abused, including alcohol, the basic problem is that those who use the drugs abusively continue to operate mechanically.

Dr. Cooper: From the medical standpoint, alcohol is a toxic substance in the human body. It creates pus in the blood, it creates cirrhosis of the liver. We used to think the person who used alcohol regularly and developed cirrhosis of the liver did so because he didn't eat. We have since found out this isn't true. It is a toxic substance to the human body.

Sociologically it is a problem. Chemically it is here. It is physiologically and otherwise a relatively dangerous substance. We lose approximately 30,000 people a year in accidents due to alcohol. Another 25,000 people die from cirrhosis of the liver, brain atrophy and complications of the liver. But it's here. Don't complicate the situation any more by adding another toxic substance. We already have a problem we don't know what the hell to do with, so don't give us another problem we don't know what the hell to do with. That is why I am against loosening the marijuana laws, although in certain instances (from our present state of knowledge) marijuana may not be as toxic to the liver and brain as alcohol, but what it does to the human body may be more dangerous.

Thomas J. Hamilton (Pacific-8 Conference): I suppose you have been wondering, as I have, what I am doing on this learned committee, but they say any good staff always has one Commander Smith on it. They say, "What about Commander Smith? He's so dumb he can't understand anything." I am Commander Smith. If I can understand it, maybe we can get the story across.

I have been exposed to this material on a committee in California, which has advanced in many ways, but we are way out ahead in the drug epidemic, too. I have served on Governor Reagan's committee, and I have been appalled by the information I have received. Dr. Jones indicated an increase of seven per cent per month in drug use. That is an epidemic. This is being introduced by the enemies of our country. Drugs are being imported into our country and distributed.

I have a grandniece eight years old in Santa Barbara who was out

playing with an eleven-year-old girl. The eleven-year-old said to her, "If you want to get high come on over and see my aunt."

Luckily, the little girl came in and told her mother and she called the police. The police said, "We can't do anything about this woman until we catch her distributing this stuff. We know all about it."

We have in our organization, in sports, the greatest antidote to this drug culture. We have the spokesmen in our coaches who influence youth to a great extent. This Committee is going to go to each of the associations, and ask the coaches not just to sit back and learn about the subject, but to take a leadership role. Young people should be told that if they have any ambitions in sports they must have nothing to do with drugs. Coaches must insist on high standards in their own squads. The coach has to stand firm, and if he finds his better athletes are using drugs, he has to wipe them off the squad, certainly until they can be rehabilitated.

But it must be made very evident to the kid five, six, seven or eight years old that if he wants to do anything in sports he cannot fool with drugs.

This is the weapon, with the forces we get can be the antidote to this real threat to our civilization. Thank you. [Applause]

Chairman Pritchard: We hope we have brought a message to you and when you go back you will re-enforce what you have learned today with additional information. We hope you will do as we have tried to do—just light one little candle. If enough of us light candles, perhaps we can make some headway. Thank you.

[The session adjourned at 11:35 a.m.]

HONORS LUNCHEON

Tuesday, January 12, 1971

The Honors Luncheon was held in Ballrooms A and B and was called to order by the President, Harry M. Cross.

President Cross: Ladies and gentlemen, we are most fortunate today to have as our master of ceremonies Ozzie Nelson, certainly one of the nation's foremost entertainers. Ozzie, as we cannot help but call him, and his family seem a part of everyone's family, along with Harriet, David and Ricky. They have visited our home and been enjoyable and entertaining.

At Rutgers University, Ozzie was an athlete. Not only was he a quarterback for three years, but was outstanding in lacrosse and swimming. You may recall he was honored at the Luncheon at Los Angeles in 1969. After a little coaching experience—I don't know whether we ought to mention that or not—he started an orchestra. Harriet Hilliard, one of the top vocalists, joined the show and Ozzie and Harriet were married in 1935.

It is with great pleasure that I present a good friend of ours, Mr. Ozzie Nelson. [Applause]

[Ozzie Nelson assumed the chair as toastmaster.]

Toastmaster Nelson: Thank you very much. I am very happy to be here. It is an unusual situation, probably one of the few times in the last 20 years that I have appeared in public without some other member of the family. In fact, as I was coming through the lobby this morning a little boy about ten years old stopped me and said, "Hey, I know you! You're Ozzie and Harriet!" [Laughter]

I came from a very small town in New Jersey and the Presbyterian church we attended had a very small congregation. One time the minister was taken very seriously ill, and the congregation voted to pray for his recovery, 81 to 76. [Laughter]

I feel it might have been a split vote that brought me to the podium today, because it is always an unusual circumstance when the master of ceremonies knows less about what is going on than the people surrounding him.

One of the characteristics of anybody who has had anything to do with athletics is that he cannot turn down any sort of challenge. Of course, some of the things that are challenges nowadays were not so challenging years ago. With our cold weather now out in California once in a while I find it is a challenge just to get up out of bed in the morning.

About 15 years ago, when David was just graduating from high school, we thought, well, this might be the last time we would be able to spend the summer vacation with our two boys. We decided to go to Europe. Ricky was a little skinny guy about 14 at that time. We finally wound up in the south of France, at a summer place, because it reminded us somewhat of Laguna Beach where we spent our summers. There was a place called Eden Rock that is a famous swimming place

the boys liked to go to. There is a swimming pool below and there are stairs with stone steps that go up, and there is a little place you can look out over the Mediterranean. It is about 30 or 40 feet high, depending upon how high it runs.

I thought I would go up there one day and look out over the Mediterranean. I was standing there and thinking how high it was and sort of like a junior-grade Acapulco, when Ricky came up and said, "Are you going to dive off here, Pop?"

I said, "Are you kidding? No, of course not! Look down there!"

"Pop, look down at the swimming pool. The people think you are going to dive."

"Well, the swimming pool and the people aren't going to like this," and I started to motion to them; No! No!

I stood there a while and Ricky said, "Pop, this is getting pretty embarrassing. I wish you would dive off."

"If it is so embarrassing, dive off yourself."

I looked down and the people were looking up and I was going this way [indicating "no"].

David, who was 17, came running up and for some ridiculous reason he thought I was going to dive off. He ran up there and thought he would dive off before I did, and he dove right off and made a beautiful dive.

I thought, if that boy can do it, I can do it, and I just caught myself in time. What am I doing, at my age? I am going to throw myself off this cliff into the water.

Just then a little boy came up, about seven or eight. He was an American boy on vacation. He looked up at me and said, "I watch you on television."

I said, "Well, thanks very much."

"Are you going to dive off here?"

"No! No! No! I am just up here looking."

He looked up at me and said, "You know, you look much older in person than you do on television." [Laughter]

So I went. [Laughter]

Every time I think of diving off a high place I think of the story that you might have heard, about a little country circus in Vienna. The featured act was a man diving from a high platform into a tank about 110 feet from the platform. The people waited around. It was a big holiday. Finally the man came out to dive and started to climb. He was an old man about 85 years old, a little skinny old man. He climbed up the ladder, and he stood there and looked down, and he said, "This is a dreadful way for a poor old man to make a living. I will dive off here and probably kill myself. How would you like it if your old grandfather made a dive like this? And it is so cold. Well, I will dive off here. I will kill myself. You paid your money. That's why you paid your money, wasn't it, to come here and see a poor old man kill himself?"

They said, "No, no, no, old man! Come down!"

And he said, "My next show is at five-thirty." [Laughter]

By the way, I am not putting these glasses on to give me a look of character, but one of the difficulties of getting old, one of the unfortunate handicaps, is you cannot see so well.

I am sure you heard the story of the guy who couldn't hear too well,

and his friends got to shouting at him. One day his friends came up and he said, "No, no, you don't have to shout. I can hear perfectly. I have just gotten a wonderful hearing aid."

His friend said, "What kind is it?"

He said, "It's a quarter to two." [Laughter]

I would like to introduce the representatives of the affiliated members of the NCAA which held meetings here. Each does an important job for intercollegiate athletics.

From the American Association of College Baseball Coaches, secretary-treasurer Lee Eilbracht of the University of Illinois; and trustee Dutch Fehring of Stanford University. [Applause]

President of the College Athletic Business Managers Association, from Kansas State University, Kim Tidd, and incoming president, Robert Cahill of the University of Notre Dame. [Applause]

Representing the National Fencing Coaches Association, its president, Michael DeCicco of the University of Notre Dame. [Applause]

Next may I present the President of the National Football Foundation Hall of Fame, an organization closely associated with my alma mater, Mr. William Geyer. [Applause]

Representing the United States Track Coaches Association is its president, Al Drew of Duke University. [Applause]

Representing the Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association, a member of the NCAA Tournament Committee, Scotty Deeds of California State College, Los Angeles.

Next it is my pleasure to introduce several persons at the head table.

The secretary-treasurer of the NCAA, who is also chairman of the Financial Aid Committee and director of athletics at Boston College, William J. Flynn. [Applause]

A member of the NCAA Council who has a special presentation to make later, secretary to the University of Pittsburgh Board of Trustees, Frank F. Carver.

The executive director of the NCAA, Walter Byers. [Applause]

It was two years ago this week that I shared an Honors Luncheon with the lovely Queen of College Football's Centennial. It is only fitting that she join us again today as the NCAA is visiting her home state. She is now a senior at Texas Tech University. Welcome a young lady who reigned so regally in a grand job, Centennial Queen Miss Barbara Specht. [Applause]

A tragedy of unprecedented magnitude struck college football this year. First, Wichita State University, then Marshall University suffered grievous loss of players, staff members and friends in plane crashes. In response to the two communities, the student bodies of the universities, television stars and many other generous people joined together to help however they could to insure that the football and the athletic program in both colleges would survive.

It is an honor for us to be able to recognize today two men who are leading the efforts to sustain these football programs. So will you join with me in expressing continuous support of their efforts?

From Marshall University, the acting director of the football program, William Dawson. [Applause]

And from Wichita State University, a man whose rebuilt team actually led the conference champion at half time, head football coach, Bob Seaman. [Applause]

Good luck and best wishes!

The ranking military officer in the Houston area has joined us, so salute our honored guest, the commanding general of Fort Sam Houston, Lieutenant General Harry H. Crist. [Applause]

Much of the information on the Medal of Honor winners and a great deal of general assistance at the Luncheon was provided by the president of the Medal of Honor Society. A graduate of Texas A&M, he is now a professor of soil management there. I would like to have Dr. Eli Whiteley come to the rostrum and accept from President Cross a token of the appreciation of the NCAA for his work. [Presentation and applause]

A most meaningful part of the NCAA honors program is the recognition of its postgraduate scholars who represent here today the NCAA scholarship winners. It is fitting that the man who will introduce them was president of the NCAA when the program was initiated in 1964. He currently is a member of the NCAA Executive Committee and dean of the Division of Extension and University Services, University of Iowa, Robert F. Ray. [Applause]

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. Nelson, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: Today we have with us five young men representing the total number of 417 who have received the \$1000 NCAA postgraduate scholarship.

Two of the young men who are with us today currently are attending graduate school and utilizing the scholarship, and three are 1970 football scholarship winners who will begin graduate studies in 1971.

Today we honor excellence by presenting awards to those who have had influence of intercollegiate athletics in their lives, and we also pay tribute to those to whom we look for leadership and excellence in the world of tomorrow.

I am confident, after examining the outstanding records of these young men, that they and their colleagues whom we honor today will be among the leaders of this nation in the future.

The 417 scholarships represent a substantial investment in the future. Since the program began it has grown from 32 awards annually to 80, and this year the investment will grow to \$464,000 that has been provided by this Association.

In order to win a postgraduate scholarship, a student-athlete must have earned at least a 3.000 or "B" accumulative grade point average for three years of college work and have performed with distinction in his sport. In addition, he must have signified his intention to begin graduate study at the earliest possible time and he must have been judged capable of going graduate work by the university of his choice.

Now it is my pleasure to present these five young men.

The first is James Michael Heitmann, who was a 1970 award winner. His sport was basketball at Texas A&M University. His graduate program is to achieve a degree of doctor of veterinary medicine at Texas A&M. His home town is Houston. He earned a 3.52 grade point average in veterinary medicine as an undergraduate student and finished his career as A&M's fifth leading career scorer.

Mike was team captain and most valuable player and averaged over 20 points per game as a senior. He was chosen on the All-Southwest Conference Team.

Upon graduation he received the Mark Francis Scholarship in honor of the founder of the College of Veterinary Medicine, at A&M. [Applause]

The next young man is Charles David Cooper, a 1969 award winner in the sport of tennis at Clemson University. His graduate program is to seek the degree of master of science in chemical engineering at Wright University. His home town is Winter Park, Florida. He earned a 3.8 grade point average in chemical engineering as an undergraduate. He was the No. 1 varsity tennis player for three years, and captain for two of those years. He led his team to an undefeated season as a senior.

He was freshman class president and a member of the Student Court and Senate. He received the Clemson and Atlantic Coast Scholarship Athletic Award and other academic awards, topped by his selection as Clemson University's outstanding student. [Applause]

First, David Cole Elmendorf, a 1970 winner in the sport of football at Texas A&M University. He had a 3.84 grade point average in economics. His home town is Houston. David is a Consensus All-America at defensive safety and team captain who was chosen as Football Foundation scholar-athlete. He has been an All-Southwest Conference baseball player for two seasons. He was a standout performer in the North-South game, and the director of athletics, Coach Gene Stallings said of him, "He is one young man whom mere words cannot adequately describe." He is planning to enter law. [Applause]

The next honoree is James Ellis Lindsey, 1970, for football at Abilene Christian College. He had a 3.3 average in physical education. His hometown is Sweeney, Texas. Jim is the 1970 College Division All-America Quarterback. He was honorable mention All-America for the two preceding years. He holds five NCAA career records in passing and total offense and 19 Southland Conference records. He was team captain and three times an All-Conference player. He participated in the North-South Shrine game on Christmas Day.

He was president of the Physical Education Major Club at his college. He was on the Dean's Honor Roll in 1969 and is a member of the Blue Key Honorary Fraternity. He plans to coach at the college level and will use his scholarship to pursue a master's degree in physical education. [Applause]

Our next honoree is Willie Frank Zapalac, Jr., 1970 for football at the University of Texas at Austin. He has a 3.33 grade point average in architectural engineering. His home town is Austin. An outstanding linebacker, he has been co-captain of the team which won 1970 regular season honors and the 1969 national championship. He played in only two losing games in 34 varsity games. He was a starter for three years and was chosen as a Football Foundation Scholar-Athlete and elected to the Academic All-America team. He was on the major college academic team three times.

He is a member of the Silver Spur service organization, and he was selected the outstanding junior student in architectural engineering at the end of the last academic year. His father is an assistant coach on the Texas football staff. [Applause]

Now to respond for these and the other postgraduate scholars, it is my pleasure to present to you Dave Elmendorf. [Applause]

David Cole Elmendorf: President Cross, President Hahn, Dr. Kraft,

Medal of Honor Winners, Honored Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is indeed an honor to be seated at the head table with such a distinguished group. The NCAA has received much recognition for its support of organized college athletics, but has received much too little attention for its aid to colleges' main function of education.

Given this opportunity, I would like to express the sincere thanks that NCAA scholarship winners across the country feel toward this great organization for allowing us to continue our education at a time when education more than any one thing is the means to accepting the challenge posed by a troubled nation.

So speaking for the 80 scholarship winners this year and all 417 over the past six years, I say collectively—Thank you, NCAA. We accept the scholarships and we accept the challenge. [Applause]

Frank F. Carver (University of Pittsburgh): Ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege and pleasure to present to Tom Hamilton for a lifetime of dedicated service to intercollegiate athletics, a token of appreciation by the NCAA. However, I believe I speak for more than the NCAA as a corporate body. A lot of people in this room, a lot of institutions represented, a lot of organizations represented will honor this man.

Two weeks ago in New York City he stood very tall on the dais as a Gold Medal Winner of the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame, as well he should have.

There are coaches and athletic directors in this audience who have had the pleasure of serving with him in the Navy V-5 program. There are many athletic directors over the country who are very thankful that in the early days of V-5 Tom Hamilton led the fight for unrestricted V-5. The Naval Academy owes him for his services as a player, as a coach and as an athletic director.

The University of Pittsburgh owes him a great deal for restoring its prestige in athletics, and more than that, for making the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania realize the value of that institution to it.

The Eastern College Athletic Conference in its formative years made good use of his advice, and the NCAA for a long time has had the benefit of his advice and countless hours of hard work. He never turned down an assignment.

So, Tom, for your dedication to intercollegiate athletics, I want to speak for everybody here and everybody around. Thank you very much. [Presentation of pen set following which the assembly rose and applauded.]

Thomas J. Hamilton (Pacific-8 Conference): Thank you, Frank and gentlemen. It is really an honor to be here with these distinguished men who have received the highest honor that our nation can bestow for their military service and with the recipients of NCAA scholarships. I congratulate you, and to be accompanying you on the dais is a great thing.

I received a rather overwhelming recognition from you which coming to a working member, surprised me but we have together a great commodity, a great product, in our sports program and in our nation's educational system. I have enjoyed very much and am proud of the ability and talents of the athletic profession. The strength of our organization is going to be very important in keeping things on the right track. Thank you very much. [Applause]

Toastmaster Nelson: Now it is time to honor a very special group of men, the holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor who were varsity athletes. Each man will receive the NCAA Commemorative Plaque from President Cross, recognizing a notable contribution to the nation's welfare and progress.

The Congressional Medal of Honor is unique in several ways. Not only is it the nation's highest military award for bravery, but also the first United States award created for heroic service in the nation's armed forces. It grew out of a need in the early days of the Civil War for recognizing valor.

Accordingly, the Medal of Honor was awarded on December 1, 1861, in the Navy and in the Army the medal was awarded in 1862, six months later.

The criteria are that there must be at least two witnesses, and the person must have distinguished himself in conflict with the enemy by gallantry and courage at the risk of his life and above and beyond the call of duty.

Approximately half of the Medals were awarded posthumously.

This information was sent to me a couple of days ago, and I read these citations aloud to Harriet. I am sure you will feel as I do. I don't know when I have been so emotionally moved by anything in my life. I am going to read these rather slowly because they really go beyond the imagination, the amazing contribution that these men have made to our country and to our way of life.

Captain Paul W. Bucha, United States Military Academy, 1965. Swimming and water polo. His institutional representative, Jack Lyon, head swimming coach of the United States Military Academy.

While at West Point, Captain Bucha was a "distinguished cadet" all four years. He graduated in the top three per cent of his class. He lettered in swimming four years and in water polo three years. He was captain of the Academy swimming team his senior year. He was selected All-America in 1964 and 1965 and holds two Military Academy records.

Captain Bucha won the Medal of Honor while a company commander on a reconnaissance-in-force mission against enemy forces near Phuoc Vinh, Vietnam, March 16-19, 1968. The company was brought into a suspected enemy stronghold by helicopter to locate and destroy the enemy. After being wounded by shrapnel, he still led his men against strong enemy forces. His company received heavy casualties, and the wounded Bucha had to direct by flashlight the nighttime medical evacuation of three air-ambulance loads of seriously wounded personnel and the helicopter supply of his company.

He also led a rescue party to recover the dead and wounded members of an ambushed element.

Captain Paul W. Bucha. [Presentation of plaque and applause]

James M. Burt, Norwich University, 1939. Football. His institutional representative is Joe Stayball, head football coach, Norwich University.

James Burt lettered in football, playing right end and averaging 50 minutes per game for four years.

From 1941 to 1946 he served as a tank company commander with the 66th Armored Regiment of the Second Armored Regiment in Africa, Sicily and on the trek from Omaha Beach to Berlin.

He received the Medal of Honor for repeatedly risking his life dur-

ing nine days of fighting in the Battle of Aachen, Germany, in October, 1944. On the first day he repeatedly exposed himself to heavy enemy fire by which he was wounded in the face and neck, in order to rescue wounded comrades, to destroy enemy personnel and equipment, to direct artillery fire and to contribute significantly by sheer example to the victory.

He rescued the infantry commander when he was wounded and commanded the joint forces alone. Three times he went behind enemy lines on reconnaissance. Twice the tank was shot out from beneath him, but he boarded another and continued in battle. As a result, the men were inspired to overcome rigid weather conditions and in one of the most bitter local actions of the war to achieve an important victory.

James M. Burt. [Presentation of plaque and applause]

Brigadier General R. E. Galer, University of Washington, 1935, basketball. His institutional representative is Joseph L. Kearney, director of athletics at the University of Washington.

Born in Seattle, Washington, on October 23, 1930, General Galer was an All-America forward in 1935. Upon graduation from college he entered the Marine Corps where he remained until his retirement in 1957. He is currently a business executive in Dallas.

General Galer won his Medal of Honor for leading his squadron in repeated raids against Japanese forces in the Solomon Islands in 1942.

He individually shot down 11 enemy bombers and fighter aircraft over a period of 29 days. His squadron, although suffering extreme physical strain because of continuous operations at an altitude above 25,000 feet, shot down 27 Japanese planes.

Brig. Gen. R. E. Galer! [Applause and presentation of plaque]

Nathan G. Gordon, University of Arkansas, 1939, football. Institutional representative, George Cole, director of athletics, University of Arkansas.

Nathan Gordon was an outstanding end at Arkansas in 1936 and 1937. In 1941, he enlisted in the Navy. He served as a Naval aviator in the Southwest Pacific and was discharged as a Lieutenant Commander in October, 1945.

He was elected lieutenant governor of Arkansas in 1946 and served 10 consecutive terms, 1947-1967.

He won the Medal of Honor as commander of a Catalina patrol plane for rescuing the crew of a United States plane which was shot down and crashed just offshore in Kavieng Harbor in the Birmarck Sea, February 15, 1944. He flew into the harbor defying close-range fire from enemy shore guns to make three separate landings and to pick up nine men, several of them injured. He took off, his plane dangerously overloaded, only to hear a report of another group stranded in a rubber liferaft 600 yards from the enemy shore. He turned back, again sat his plane down under heavy direct fire, and took aboard six more survivors before making his fourth dexterous takeoff.

Honoree Nathan G. Gordon. [Presentation of plaque and applause]

Major Robert F. Foley, United States Military Academy, 1963, basketball. His institutional representative is Major Jim Burns, deputy director of athletics, United States Military Academy.

Born in Newton, Massachusetts, in May of 1941, Major Foley excelled in basketball at Belmont High School and went on to do the same at the Military Academy.

Major Foley won his Medal of Honor near Quan Dau Tieng, in Vietnam in November, 1966, for his leadership and courageous fighting while directing a company in action in the dense jungle. When his unit encountered a strong enemy defensive position, Captain Foley attacked under intense fire. He charged the enemy with a machine gun until the enemy fire became so intense he ordered his men to take cover. He advanced alone until the wounded were cleared. Then he moved to the other flank where he was immediately blown off his feet by an enemy grenade. He got up and led the attack on several gun replacements and personally destroyed three.

His outstanding leadership lasted over a period of several hours.

Major Robert F. Foley! [Presentation of plaque and applause]

Brigadier General Joseph Jacob Foss of the University of South Dakota. Football, track and rifle. His institutional representative is John Roning, director of athletics, University of South Dakota.

General Foss served in both World War II and the Korean Conflict, first in the Marine Corps and then in the Air Force.

From 1949 to 1953, General Foss was a member of the South Dakota House of Representatives. He was governor of the state from 1954 to 1958 and was commissioner of the American Football League from 1959 to 1966.

On television he has starred in two shows, "The Outdoorsman: Joe Foss" and currently, "Outdoors with Liberty Mutual."

General Foss won his Medal of Honor for engaging in almost daily combat with the enemy while executive officer of a Marine fighting squadron at Guadalcanal October 9 to November 19, 1942. He personally shot down 23 Japanese planes and damaged others severely. On January 15, 1943, he shot down three more enemy planes; and on the 25th, he led 12 planes against a larger enemy squadron, shooting down four Japanese fighters and turning back the bombers that were escorting them, before they had dropped a single bomb.

He repeatedly demonstrated exceptionally fine spirit and leadership.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Jacob Foss. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

William E. Hall, University of Redlands, 1936, cross country and track. His institutional representative is Paul Taylor, head baseball coach at the University of Redlands.

William Hall earned his letter in cross country during his freshman year. He was on the varsity track team his junior and senior years as a member of the 880-yard relay team; the mile relay team, which placed first in the 1936 Southern California College Relays; and was a low hurdler.

He is currently a senior adjudicator with the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Hall won the Congressional Medal of Honor during the Second World War as pilot of a scouting plane in the Coral Sea on May 7 and 8, 1942.

On May 7, he dived his plane at an enemy aircraft carrier contributing materially to the destruction of that vessel. On May 8, he repeated counterattacks against a superior number of enemy fighter planes bringing down three, and though seriously wounded he then landed his plane safely.

William E. Hall. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

Captain David McCampbell, United States Naval Academy, 1933. Swimming. His institutional representative is Captain J. L. Coppedge, director of athletics, United States Naval Academy.

Captain McCampbell remains the Navy's top-ranking ace with 34 enemy planes destroyed.

Born January 16, 1910, in Bessemer, Alabama. Captain McCampbell lettered in swimming three years while attending the Naval Academy.

He won his Medal of Honor for leading his fighter planes against a force of 80 Japanese carrier-based aircraft which were bearing down on the United States fleet June 19, 1944. In this action he personally destroyed seven of the hostile planes. The outnumbered attack force was routed and virtually annihilated. On October 24, assisted by only one other plane, Captain McCampbell intercepted an attack in formation of 60 hostile enemy airplanes approaching the United States Forces. He shot down nine Japanese planes and disorganized the enemy group completely forcing the remainder to abandon the attack before a single aircraft reached the American fleet.

Captain David McCampbell. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

Captain W. L. McGonagle, University of Redlands, football. His institutional representative is Ted Runner, athletic director of the University of Redlands.

Born in Wichita, Kansas, in 1925, Captain McGonagle entered the University of Redlands in July, 1944. He lettered in football, playing left guard on the first unbeaten Redlands football team.

In June of 1947, Captain McGonagle became an ensign in the Navy.

By June, 1967, he had become Commander of the USS Liberty, then sailing in international waters in the Eastern Mediterranean. Without warning on June 7 the Liberty was attacked by jet fighters and torpedo boats, which inflicted many casualties and caused extreme damage to the ship. Captain McGonagle remained on the badly damaged bridge even though seriously wounded, commanding, maneuvering his ship, directing its defense, supervising control of flooding and fire-fighting and supervising the caring for casualties for 17 hours.

Not until rendezvous was made with the United States destroyer did he relinquish personal control. Even then he refused badly needed medical attention until convinced the seriously wounded among his crew had been treated.

Captain W. L. McGonagle. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

Jack Montgomery, University of Redlands, 1940, football and baseball. His university representative is Frank Serack, head football coach at the University of Redlands.

Jack Montgomery lettered in football in 1938 and 1939, and in baseball in 1939-40, before entering the Army immediately after graduation.

He won the Medal of Honor for almost singlehandedly routing a strong force of enemy infantry near Padiglione, Italy, February 22, 1944.

Before daylight the enemy established themselves near the rifle platoons commanded by Lt. Montgomery. With one rifle and several hand grenades he crawled up and threw his grenades killing eight of the enemy and capturing the remaining four. Later he crawled alone down into a shallow ditch in which the enemy was entrenched and attacked with such fury that he captured seven men and he also

silenced the two machine guns. Then he directed artillery fire on a house in which a majority of the enemy remained. As they started out of the house, he alone ran forward and captured them.

He actually accounted for 11 enemy dead, 32 prisoners and an unknown number of wounded. That night he was seriously wounded by mortar fragments while aiding an adjacent unit to repulse a counter-attack.

Jack Montgomery. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

Carlos C. Ogden, Eastern Illinois University, 1940, football and basketball. His institutional representative is Tom Katsimpalis, director of athletics, Eastern Illinois University.

Carlos Ogden was born May 9, 1917 in Borton, Illinois. In basketball he was a center and in football a tackle. He lettered in both sports in 1937 and 1938. He was drafted in the spring of 1941.

After World War II, he spent ten years with the Veterans Administration and is currently the director of Selective Service for the state of California.

He has three sons who are outstanding athletes. Ralph and Bud Ogden are former All-America basketball players at Santa Clara. Another son, Jim, was an All-America swimmer at San Jose City College.

Ogden won his Medal of Honor in France on June 25, 1944. When his company was pinned down by fire from a German 88-mm. gun and two machine guns, Ogden armed himself and advanced alone under fire and, despite being wounded by a machine gun bullet he managed to silence all enemy guns with the grenades and rifle fire. His action cleared the way for his company to continue the defense.

Carlos C. Ogden. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

Major M. Sando Vargas, Jr., Northern Arizona University, 1961, baseball. His institutional representative is Norman B. Johansen, director of athletics at Northern Arizona University.

While a student at Northern Arizona, Major Vargas played first base for four years and was selected to the All-Conference team twice.

He won his Medal of Honor while serving as a company commander in Vietnam in 1968.

Though suffering from wounds incurred while relocating his unit under heavy enemy fire, Major Vargas led three companies in an attack on the village of Dai Do. He moved them across 700 meters of open rice paddies while under intense enemy fire, and obtained a foothold in two hedgerows on the enemy perimeter. When elements of his company became pinned down he led a reserve platoon to aid them and destroyed a number of enemy bunkers along the way.

Again wounded by grenade fragments he refused aid and directed and reorganized his unit into a strong defensive position. They held their position throughout the night while the enemy launched a series of unsuccessful counter-attacks. The next morning the Marines launched a counter-assault. Major Vargas remained in the open, encouraging and assisting his men and was hit for the third time in a three-day battle. Disregarding his pain, he rescued his wounded battalion commander, crossing a fire-swept area to reach him. Then he resumed supervising and encouraging his men.

Major M. Sando Vargas, Jr. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

Brigadier General William H. Wilbur, United States Military Aca-

demy, 1912, fencing. His institutional representative is Colonel A. J. Dielens, Jr., director of athletics, United States Military Academy.

Born September 24, 1888, in Palmer, Massachusetts, General Wilbur lettered in fencing, was team captain and was a member of the 1912 Intercollegiate Fencing Championship team.

General Wilbur received his Medal of Honor for preparing the plan for contacting the French Commander in Casablanca and securing an armistice to prevent unnecessary bloodshed between American and French forces. Landing at Fedala on November 8, 1942, General Wilbur commandeered a vehicle and was driven toward the hostile defenses under incessant fire before locating a French officer who accorded him passage through forward positions.

He then proceeded through total darkness across 16 miles of enemy occupied country intermittently subjected to heavy bursts of fire and delivered his letters to appropriate French officials in Casablanca. Returning, Wilbur detected a hostile battery firing on American troops. He took charge of a platoon of American tanks and personally led them in the attack on and capture of the battery.

Brigadier General William H. Wilbur. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

To respond in behalf of the Medal of Honor winners now in civilian life is the Honorable Nathan G. Gordon.

Nathan G. Gordon: On behalf of the civilian recipients of this award, I wish to express our appreciation to the NCAA for inviting us to have a part in this program. It seems to me it is particularly appropriate at this time, when patriotism and love of country seem to have gone out of style.

We all know that our leadership, both civilian and military, must come from the groups represented here. I am sure if those of my associates who have passed on were here, they would say with me that the future of our country depends upon instilling in our youth the judgment and self-sacrifice to carry on in life those lessons learned in the field of sports. Thank you. [Applause]

Toastmaster Nelson: Responding on behalf of our honored guests on active duty is Captain W. L. McGonagle.

Captain W. L. McGonagle: President Cross, Mr. Nelson, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: On behalf of the active duty honorees, may I express our humble and sincere appreciation for the honor accorded us today and for the many courtesies and the warm hospitality which has been extended to us.

Like so many others who have benefitted from their association with the NCAA coaches and their staffs, we who have been honored here today were imbued with the desire to meet the challenge of the physical and mental competition required by college sports, the importance of developing our skills and potentials, to develop self-discipline and to fulfill our responsibilities to all the members of the team without sacrificing our own individuality, and to perform the task assigned to us to the best of our ability, to defeat our opponents by doing more than was expected of us in our burning desire to win and to excel.

We tried to emulate the high standards and ideals instilled in us through our association in college sports, as we continued our association with the youth and developing leaders of our country.

I wish to thank those associated with the NCAA for their continuing contribution to the leadership of the armed services. I want to emphasize my feeling, that in honoring us you also honor the men and women who serve unselfishly our country wherever their services may be required.

Those who have served and we who serve know that service to our country is a relevant and meaningful task, one that must be carried out if freedom and the cherished ideas which support us are to survive. [Applause]

Toastmaster Nelson: I will now call on the NCAA secretary-treasurer, William J. Flynn, who will present the Theodore Roosevelt Award.

William J. Flynn (Boston College): Ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege to present the NCAA's highest honor, the Theodore Roosevelt Award to a distinguished American with a record of significant achievement.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was the first man honored with the Teddy Award. Indicating the NCAA's regard for the Teddy and for its recipients, General Eisenhower was followed by Senator Leverett Saltonstall, Justice Byron R. White and President Frederick L. Hovde of Purdue, distinguished Americans all.

The fifth Teddy winner can be most comfortable in this company. As an undergraduate at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, he was an outstanding athlete. He played outfield in baseball. He had been a catcher until he went to college, but because of his size, 5 feet 8 inches, and 145 pounds, his coach discouraged him from catching at the varsity level. He earned three letters from 1942 to 1944, and he had a three-year batting average of .325. Had the war not been in progress he would certainly have tried his hand at professional baseball. With his intelligence and leadership qualities he probably would have overcome his small size, for once he entered aeronautical engineering professionally these qualities helped move him rapidly to the top.

Today Christopher Columbus Kraft, Jr. is deputy director of the NASA Manned Space Craft Center in Houston, in charge of America's most respected athletes, our astronauts. For eight years he was director of Flight Operations. His permanent position recognizes his contribution to the extraordinary space success that this nation has enjoyed, from the first manned flight to Neil Armstrong's "giant step for mankind" and beyond.

During all these dramatic, unbelievable, complex ventures which tax the ability of the average man's mind to behold, Mr. Kraft was responsible for each flight, from liftoff to impact.

He also directed the design and implementation of the Mission Control Center here in Houston. We all know that he did his work well, probably as nearly perfectly as man is capable of performing, as we can imagine what would have happened or what would have been the price of failure or poor preparation.

Mr. Kraft credits the competitive spirit which he feels was ingrained in him during his athletic experience with creating the force which not only boosted America to the moon, but got us there well ahead of the Russians. He has said, "Competition has allowed us to bring it off. We were in competition with the Russians in the technological race. Our technology put us in front. We realized we were permitted

to put a man on the moon in the 1960's, and the element of competition has underlain all we have done."

He credits sports and his experiences as a VPI cadet with teaching him the absolute necessity for untiring preparation in order to be able to perform at one's highest level. Maintaining physical fitness is another of Mr. Kraft's requirements for his work. He reports the leaders of the Space Program exercise as much as possible, and although the astronauts are not required to do so, they seek it on their own because they realize the importance of regular exercise and fitness.

Mr. Kraft entered the space program initially through airplane flight testing. He entered Federal service in 1945 as a member of the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. In 1958, he was selected as one of the original members of the Space Task Group established to manage Project Mercury. First he was director of operations and flight, then flight director. Next, as director of flight operations Mr. Kraft directed planning and mission control activities for all Gemini missions. Currently, he guided planning and mission operations for the unmanned Apollo flight.

He was named deputy director in November, 1969, and now manages the development of space craft, crew selection and training in the conduct of space missions.

He is the recipient of many civic, academic and professional honors. He is an avid golfer and active supporter of college football and baseball.

Truly, Mr. Kraft's work has made him worthy of his middle name, Columbus, for he has led explorations into many unknown areas. He exemplifies the Teddy Award criteria of a prominent American for whom competitive athletics in college and attention to physical well being thereafter has been an important factor in a distinguished career of national significance and achievement.

It is with great pride and delight, therefore, that I call upon Christopher Columbus Kraft to receive the 1971 Theodore Roosevelt Award. [The assembly rose and applauded as the award was presented to Mr. Kraft.]

Christopher C. Kraft, Jr.: President Cross, Secretary Flynn, Distinguished Guests, Dr. Hahn, Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like first to pay tribute to the fine group of Americans with whom we are surrounded here. It makes one feel very proud of being an American indeed.

I am most pleased that you honored me with the Theodore Roosevelt Award. I must say I was most surprised, but very happy that I was even considered for this award.

Baseball has always been my first love, but my aspirations far exceeded my ability to play the game. The coaches at Virginia Tech such as Ed Laird, Michael Sever and Johnny Barker were always kind and allowed me the opportunity to play. Seriously, I would like to say how much my association with these dedicated men really meant to me because of the inspiration they provided.

I have oftentimes looked back at my college life and tried to find those things from which I benefited most in my playing career. Certainly one must receive the fundamentals of the particular position but these are wholly tentative upon one's capability to absorb the

knowledge and really have little effect on shaping one's character or preparing an individual for such things as management and leadership.

I believe that my experience in the field of athletics and as a member of the corps of cadets at Virginia Tech had a very profound effect on shaping my future. The experience and intuitive background that the whole realm of athletics provides is almost priceless. One gains respect for his teammates and learns to judge one's adversaries through athletic competition that can be gained in no other endeavor. It teaches one to accept the exhilaration of victory with respect and deal with the true problems in accepting defeat. It also underlines the absolute necessity for untiring preparation in order to be in the best of positions to perform at one's highest level.

These qualities certainly have been paramount in bringing about the success we have had in the nation's space program. I have seen the same characteristics of the athletes in the people who conduct missions and carry out the management of our most complex space operations. These people learn their task by the same technic of continued practice and review in identical fashion to the athletes themselves. The tremendous pressure that exists at the point of time of decision can only be dealt with as a result of actions which have become second nature. Indeed, the astronauts themselves are typical examples of today's most respected athletes.

Today's world of collegiate athletics is intensely competitive, very often expensive, and many times criticized as an over-emphasized part of college life. However, I am convinced that its results have had tremendous beneficial effects on the position of preeminence that this country has held. For this reason it is most important that you, the NCAA, maintain a strong and active organization and assure us all that college athletics will continue to progress in the future.

Thank you again for the honor you have bestowed on me. [Applause]

Mr. Flynn: Now to receive the institutional Teddy Award and to respond for Mr. Kraft's alma mater, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, I have the honor to present its President, T. Marshall Hahn, Jr. [Applause]

T. Marshall Hahn, Jr.: Thank you, Mr. Flynn and Mr. Nelson. President Cross, Distinguished Honorees, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a pleasure to accept and express appreciation for this institutional plaque given to the university to honor a very distinguished alumnus, Chris Kraft, the fifth recipient of the Theodore Roosevelt Award.

Chris is a member of the class of 1945, but displaying the high ability for which he is being honored here today, he observed an accelerated schedule of academic studies and completed the degree requirements, graduating with the class of 1944. In fact, our alumni office is not yet sure today whether he is a member of the class of 1944 or the class of 1945.

Despite that accelerated academic schedule, as Mr. Flynn indicated to you, he participated very successfully in intercollegiate athletics at the university. In addition, he was selected as the outstanding cadet and he served as president of the institution's corps of cadets.

Mr. Flynn has outlined to you, and indeed it is well recognized that Mr. Kraft's rise to national eminence and his contribution to the nation's space effort were spectacular indeed.

He has also maintained and continues today a very strong interest

in sports. You would be interested to know that one of his proudest possessions is a baseball he acquired when he was nine years old, carrying the autographs of Babe Ruth and Lou Gehrig, and he still is remembered by members of the coaching staff at Virginia Tech as one of the stellar performers and the developer of really high standards in the baseball program.

He continues to be proficient at golf. He follows intercollegiate athletics closely and I assure you he is a strong and effective supporter of Virginia Tech's developing football, basketball, baseball and other intercollegiate programs.

I might add I am particularly pleased that he received this honor today because he now also serves as my boss, being a member of the University Corps of Visitors, and in these trying times in higher education today anything that makes our bosses happy is a real asset. [Laughter]

All of us at Virginia Tech are indeed delighted in joining you in congratulating Chris Kraft on receiving the NCAA's highest honor. Congratulations, Chris, and thank you very much. [Applause]

Toastmaster Nelson: Thank you, Dr. Hahn. This concludes the proceedings, and I will return you to President Cross. [Applause]

[President Cross resumed the chair.]

President Cross: Thank you very much, Ozzie, for a grand job. You have done much to make this an enjoyable occasion. Now, to show our appreciation, please step up and let me present you with a memento which will help remind you of this occasion. [Presentation of silver bowl]

Toastmaster Nelson: Thank you very much. I hardly feel worthy of any sort of award here today, following all these illustrious gentlemen. They say you have to be very careful because subconsciously if there is something you receive that you don't feel you're entitled to, you lose it, so if anybody sees it lying around the hotel please return it to me. [Laughter]

There is the story of a man who checked out of his hotel and walked about two blocks and suddenly realized he had lost his umbrella, he had left it back in his hotel room. He went back to the hotel and said to the clerk, "I checked out of Room 325 and I left my umbrella there. May I have it?"

The clerk said, "I am sorry, but a newly wed couple just checked in there. If you go up and knock on the door I am sure it will be okay and you just tell them to give you your umbrella."

He went up and was about to knock on the door when he heard a voice that said, "Whose beautiful eyes are those?"

And she said, "They are yours, Honey."

He said, "Whose lovely little nose is that?"

She said, "That's yours, Honey,"

He said, "Whose delightful lips are those?"

She said, "They are yours, Honey."

He knocked on the door and said, "When you get to the umbrella, that's mine." [Laughter and applause]

Thank you very much. I will really treasure this. I don't mean just because it is so beautiful, but when I get back home and show it to Harriet it will be tangible proof what I have been doing the last

couple of days. Thank you so much. It has been a real pleasure for me. [Applause]

President Cross: Now, if you will please rise, The Rev. Clyde J. Verheyden will offer the benediction.

Rev. Clyde J. Verheyden: Now may the grace of our Lord and Savior, the love of God our Father in Heaven, and the fellowship and power bring us joy and peace forever. Amen.

[Adjournment at 2:45 p.m.]

BUSINESS SESSION

Wednesday, January 13, 1971

The Business Session of the Sixty-fifth Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened in the Ballroom of the Astroworld Hotel, Houston, Texas, at 9:20 a.m., Harry M. Cross, NCAA President and professor of law at the University of Washington, presiding.

President Cross: I declare the continuation of our business session open.

If we run according to the schedule—that is, break for lunch—anything which happens this morning will be in the ordinary course open to reconsideration up until the scheduled time of adjournment, and if your plans call for you to leave before five o'clock, all I can say is you take that risk.

Secondly, if there is not objection at noon or perhaps before, and it appears that we can finish within another hour, it is my intention to continue the session to final adjournment rather than breaking for lunch.

Bill Maybry (Southwestern College) has agreed to be chairman of the Committee on Voting where he has served with some distinction for a number of years, because Frank Forbes is unable to be here.

Also, on the Nominating Committee, the officers appointed William Exum of Kentucky State College to serve in the absence of Frank Forbes.

I would like to spend just a moment before we turn to the first item of business today to again thank Tom Hansen and the staff for the organization and management of that wonderful Honors Luncheon we had yesterday. I have heard many of you say you thought it was the best among many good ones. It certainly was a privilege to be able to chair that meeting.

As usual, the general organization of the convention has been effectively done, for which Gene Duffy has our thanks as well as the others of the staff.

7. REPORT OF THE TELEVISION COMMITTEE.

William J. Flynn (Boston College): Mr. President and Gentlemen: I believe you all received the NCAA Television Committee Report for 1970 at the registration desk.

The 1970 NCAA Television Committee approached this year with some fear and trepidation because it had to complete the challenge of the centennial year with its queen and all-time All-America football team. However, we are pleased to report that NCAA television this year had its highest rating of all time and that the attendance also hit an all-time high.

We also wish to pay tribute to a man who was our program director from its inception in 1952, Asa Bushnell. He truly has been the backbone, the historian, the balance wheel, the guiding light that has

handled all the big and little problems that originated over the years in the television program. I certainly want to salute him, and I know you join with me in wishing him every success and happiness in his retirement. I am very happy to inform you that he has accepted the NCAA's offer to continue on a consulting basis.

I became chairman in midstream, so to speak, when Forest Evashevski left intercollegiate athletics. I want to pay my respects to him for his leadership over the years on the Television Committee.

So as chairman, I am very grateful to the NCAA members for their understanding and cooperation. Gratitude also is due the Television Committee members for their time and the job that they have done.

On page 17, it is shown that this year the most total homes per season was accomplished, namely 16.2 million, which means that an average of some 25.9 million people watched more than five minutes of each college football game during the past year. We had 35 football games and in 29 of them almost 26 million people watched for at least five minutes.

On a single game basis, the Nielsen ratings showed that the Notre Dame-Southern California wild card selection on November 28 set an all-time NCAA record. Some 37.3 million people tuned in to that intersectional battle for more than five minutes.

Page 30 has to do with attendance, and of course our very fundamental purpose is to protect the gate. The biggest one-season increase in attendance in the 23 years of official national attendance records was accomplished in 1970, namely 29.5 million people attended college football games, an increase of 6.66 per cent over the previous year.

The 1970 Television Committee directed its efforts toward capitalizing on and consolidating the promotional impetus college football developed during its Centennial season in 1969.

Extensive effort was expended to develop a strong NCAA promotional program and to achieve significant participation by the carrying network. For the first time, preseason radio and television promotional shows were produced, while a college football billboard was created for the second year, featuring a slightly revised college football symbol.

Careful scrutiny was accorded the 1970-71 Plan during its first year of operation, and the conclusion was reached that it functioned well and achieved the objectives of the 1969 Committee in designing it.

A third major area of effort was study of CATV and closed circuit television, the positive and negative aspects of which the Committee considered at length. Debate rages within the industry at present concerning the degree of the future effect of CATV upon television as we know it today, but it appears that it will be considerable. The Committee intends to do all that is possible to see that the effect upon college football is not adverse.

With the authorization of 11-game schedules adding interesting matches to the schedules of many institutions, the 1970 schedule was most attractive, as reflected in increased ratings over 1969's all-time record gains of 11 per cent. At the same time, in-stadium attendance was rising for the 17th successive season and the popularity of the game seemed at an all-time high in this, college football's 102nd year.

The Committee and the Association played a role in attempts to resolve a far less pleasant part of the 1970 season, the tragic airplane

crashes which struck the Wichita State University and Marshall University teams. The NCAA television series was used to appeal to sports fans across the nation for funds to assist with the staggering expenses which resulted from the crashes and to assist the families of those lost.

In the light of this year's developments and the situation existing at season's end, the 1970 Television Committee feels that it will provide maximum guidance to its successor 1971 Committee if it repeats, stresses and reaffirms the most important recommendations offered by its immediate predecessor units, the Committees of 1968 and 1969.

These are the following:

- (1) Do not allow the Association's television policies to become stagnated; instead, effect revisions and new departures which will assure keeping pace with the dramatic growth and expansion of the Television medium;
- (2) Strive always to achieve guaranty that the current Television Plan through its components will both protect and promote the sport of collegiate football, and will concomitantly foster companion increases in game attendance and in telecast viewership.
- (3) Urge and prevail upon the Association's membership to continue the indispensable support of the Television controls which have brought patent benefits over the past two decades.
- (4) Remain ever alert to any and all possibilities for increased service and co-adjuvance to the NCAA and NCAA football.

Mr. Chairman, I move the acceptance of this report.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

President Cross: When you registered you also received a copy of the Annual Reports, in which, beginning on page 21 and running through page 38, are the reports of the other committees. Unless there is objection, we will treat those reports as having been duly received.

8. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Awards

H. Boyd McWhorter (University of Georgia): Mr. Chairman, Proposal No. 1 (page A-1) is an amendment to Article 3 of the Constitution. The effect of this amendment would be to delete the itemizing of the awards that may be given, provided they are properly personalized. It permits multiple awards, any number, but the total value of any and all awards cannot exceed \$100.

Gentlemen, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of this amendment.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

Principles Governing Financial Aid

Robert Latour (Bucknell University): There is a student on the Bucknell University campus who is a recipient of the Tony Lema Memorial Scholarship Award. This young man was not recruited by Bucknell University. He is not an outstanding golfer. In fact, he is struggling to be in the sixth position on an average team.

I understand the stipulation in the presentation of the Tony Lema Memorial Scholarship Award is that the recipient should have an interest in golf. Bucknell University feels that our intercollegiate

athletic program is part of our educational process. This young man would like to compete in intercollegiate golf. The only reason he is able to attend college is through the kindness of the Tony Lema Memorial Scholarship program, and thus Bucknell University is concerned about this boy's not being able to participate.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 2. [The motion was seconded.]

J. William Davis (Texas Tech University): On behalf of the Council, I have been asked to oppose this proposal. It has nothing to do with opposition to Tony Lema, to Bucknell or to anybody. It simply is a matter of principle. This makes an exception to a rather long-standing Constitutional provision and interpretation. It would open the door for every type of award to be asked for and gain admission. If you grant it to one, you would have no grounds for failing to grant it to any number which were awarded, and therefore I suggest that this proposal be defeated.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): Mr. President, although I am not in favor of this particular motion—I concur with my colleague from Southwest Conference—I am very much concerned about the implications of defeating this motion. The Council should explore this area some more. Although this is a specific case, there are a lot of such similar scholarship awards being made and administered by institutions.

Jesse Hill (University of Southern California): Mr. President, I am not sure all the delegates are aware of how these Tony Lema Scholarships are awarded. We do not have a recipient at USC. As I understand it, 15 of these scholarships have been awarded in its four-year history. The recipients are at 15 different schools. They have a composite of a grade point average of 3.4. The scholarships are awarded on the basis of need, academic excellence and good moral character.

It would be a mistake not to give great consideration to this because about half of the recipients would be able to play college golf. They cannot at the present time. These scholarships are giving 15 very deserving young men the opportunity to attend the college of their choice, and I feel they should be permitted to compete in intercollegiate golf.

[Proposal No. 2 (page A-1) failed for lack of a two-thirds majority, 166-125.]

Summer Basketball

Edward Steitz (Springfield College): Mr. President, I speak in behalf of the Eastern College Athletic Conference and as past president of the Eastern College Athletic Conference Basketball Association, with over 190 of its members overwhelmingly supporting Proposal No. 3.

The legislation, as the membership realizes, embodies stringent control. It embodies the fact that the institution must give permission for the individual to participate. It embodies the fact that the league must be approved by the NCAA. You can use one or two of those controls, obviously, but again I point out that the institution has the right to deny an individual permission to participate even though the league may be approved by the NCAA.

I point out further, Mr. President, that the seven restrictions are

quite stringent. Only one player from an institution may participate on the team. It denies that any member from any college staff participate in that team's operation at all. It denies any expenses whatsoever or any paid directly or indirectly.

Of course, the fourth point is that you can only play on one team.

The fifth point is no admission shall be charged whatsoever.

The sixth is no all-star games, and the seventh is no postseason playoffs.

This legislation, Mr. President, would give our basketball players the privilege of playing in their local communities in recreation programs.

These restrictions are more stringent than the programs that we condone and permit at the present time in baseball and soccer.

In light of these controls plus the desire of the ECAC to have students participate in what we regard as wholesome recreation programs, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 3. [The motion was seconded.]

Tom Scott (Davidson College): I am speaking in behalf of the University Division Basketball Tournament Committee. We were somewhat amazed to learn that the ECAC is making such a proposal. If you will recall in the early 1960's, gambling and bribery in basketball occurred which involved problems to college athletes. At that time some of the Eastern universities were deeply concerned and requested help from the entire NCAA membership to help solve the problem of gambling.

As a result, in January, 1962, the NCAA enacted legislation prohibiting out-of-season organized basketball competition. This legislation must have helped because as of this date there have been no recurrences of gambling.

In addressing the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics, later in 1962, Peter Andrill, of the district attorney's office in New York, said that in talking with the involved athletes, 90 per cent stated that initial contact by the gamblers had been made at summer camps where these programs were being conducted.

Students can now play summer basketball, but not on an organized basis. Constitution 3-9-(c) authorizes the Council to permit worthwhile summer basketball, for example, the Pan American Games, the Olympic Games, the World University Games or the pre-Olympic competition that was held last year.

Our Committee strongly recommends that the membership vote against this proposal to insure that gambling will not reappear on the intercollegiate athletic scene.

J. D. Morgan (University of California, Los Angeles): I strongly support Mr. Scott's position on this amendment. I ask the membership to reflect that regardless of what may seem to be a controlled summer basketball program, it does create the very vehicle which brought undesirable contacts and elements to college basketball.

We have had healthy support in basketball for the past ten years. It is thriving, it is growing. The practice and playing season is sufficiently long and I urge the membership to defeat this amendment.

Tom Niland (LeMoyne College): This request was brought about by many of the College Division schools in the East, and as Mr. Scott stated, there is an opportunity to play summer basketball—if you

happen to be one of the 10 best college players in the country, you can play on a world tour of some kind. But what about the thousands of college basketball players who cannot play in their own YMCA league?

Maybe we are talking about two different things. Maybe there should be some distinction between a College Division and a University Division player. No College Division player I know of was ever brought to trial or convicted of any particular crime, and yet we continue to punish many people who have committed no crime at all.

The committee did a great deal of work in investigating this. They recognized the past failures and what had taken place at the National Association of Basketball Coaches convention last year. These coaches are involved, it is their job, it is their stake in life, and they voted overwhelmingly to recommend this legislation to the NCAA.

[Proposal No. 3 (pages A-1 and A-2) was defeated by voice vote.]

Soccer

Robert W. Pritchard (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): Mr. President, I recommend Proposal No. 4 and move its adoption. [The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to allow soccer players to compete in Pan American and Olympic soccer tryouts and competition without jeopardizing their intercollegiate eligibility.

[Proposal No. 4 (pages A-2 and A-3) was approved by voice vote.]

Interpretations

J. William Davis (Texas Tech University): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 5 (page A-3). [The motion was seconded.]

This proposal was suggested to the Council by the Collegiate Commissioners Association. The Council endorsed it as a means of regularizing the procedures for knowing when and how new interpretations come into effect.

Heretofore, generally interpretations have not been circulated and known very quickly.

Now we have an instrument through which this can be done, and that is the NCAA News. A section of the NCAA News is devoted to interpretations. This amendment implements the procedure whereby these things come into being and are effective upon the entire membership.

Now Amendment A to the proposal is to ease up the last sentence of the first paragraph of Section 2: "Any member of the Association may request that any such interpretation be passed upon by the next annual Convention, by making such request in accordance with the same procedures required for the submission of an amendment of the Constitution or Bylaws to an annual Convention."

We propose to permit this request to be made in "writing to the Secretary prior to one o'clock in the afternoon on the day preceding the final business session of the Convention."

It makes it easier to bring this to the attention of the Convention if such is to be done.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment A (pages A-3 and A-4).

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 5, as amended. [The motion was seconded.]

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. President, is the procedure now clear that if one wishes to propose an amendment to an interpretation he would follow the same procedure by submitting it in writing to the Secretary prior to one o'clock the day prior to the business session, or is he limited only to requesting that the matter be acted upon by the Convention as it has been approved by the Council?

President Cross: No, I think the freedom to modify that we have had before is not destroyed at all. The initiation of consideration of an interpretation may follow this procedure which has not been formalized before.

Mr. Ray: Does the same procedure then apply to interpretations that may have been approved in a prior year as opposed only to those which would have been approved by the Council in the period between the one convention and the next?

President Cross: The way this is written—and in general it has been the practice of the Convention before—it must be done in a timely fashion which would mean it must be done at the next succeeding Convention. You cannot wait a year, at least by this rule. You would have to propose ordinary legislation.

Mr. Ray: To amend an interpretation?

President Cross: Well, you cannot use this method except at the next Convention, as this is written.

Tom Hamilton (Pacific-8 Conference): The Collegiate Commissioners Association felt this would solidify procedures and make some improvement in an area which was not covered. We have had difficulty in that when an interpretation was requested, the answer applied only to the person who asked the question and not the full membership of the NCAA. So this was the reason for requesting that this procedure be equalized for the whole group.

Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley (West Coast Athletic Conference): Mr. President, I am not clear about the binding force of these interpretations. It says "after their publication and circulation to the membership." Is this solely through the NCAA News?

Mr. Davis: I would say, yes. Of course, there are other means of notification, but that is the official one, and one of the purposes of the News is to so inform the general body of the Association.

Rev. Crowley: So it would not be a bulletin from the executive office that would make it official? It would have to go to the News?

Mr. Davis: I would say, not necessarily. If, again, something were distributed to the membership by way of a bulletin from the executive office, that would be sufficient, too. I am using the News simply because we all get that, and that is the most available and easily received communication. I would not think it would be limited to that.

Robley Williams (University of California, Berkeley): As I understand it, in the interest of speed the News, of course, comes out frequently. As I understand it also the intention is that the News will come out even more promptly.

As I recall, the interpretations now appear in the News, and up to now these have been directly sponsored in the form of questions and answers in nonofficial, but good basic English as to interpretation. At the time of their appearance, these have not been approved by the

Council. If they are to come out 24 times a year, that would practically have to be so. Do I understand from now on that the items we would consider official interpretations, upon which we may offer an amendment in the form proposed, would be restricted to what appears in the News after having been approved by the Council?

Mr. Davis: The answer to the last question is: No, it is not restricted. The answer also is that there are O.I.'s which have been approved by the Council that we know are included in there.

President Cross: You notice that the president, secretary and executive director have the collective authority to issue interpretations between the meetings of the Council and those become binding as much as those of the Council. Those, of course, are reviewed by the Council in quarterly meetings, and then all interpretations come before the Convention. But as soon as the official publication is made, it is binding whether the original source is the Officers, the Council or, of course, the Convention itself.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): If I am interpreting this correctly, this becomes a legislative process?

President Cross: This has been the legislative process. This merely puts it in writing and formalizes it.

[Proposal No. 5 (page A-3), as amended, was approved by voice vote.]

Transportation, Visitations and Entertainment

Robley Williams (University of California, Berkeley): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 6 which amends Article 1, Section 5, of the Bylaws by adding a new paragraph (f). [The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this is obvious. The Council, of course, approves of this and I am speaking for the Council. This proposal clarifies Official Interpretation 113 which points out that if there is a game played off campus in which the institution happens to be appearing that a prospect may not be transported to that game. This amendment would provide in the case of the type of disaster referred to, that of necessity games played by this institution at a site away from its own campus would be for this purpose considered to be on-campus competition.

Edward Bennett (Washington State University): Mr. President, I urgently ask the membership to vote for this for selfish reasons, but also to point out that you may find you cannot control the number of pyromaniacs in your community. They might burn your campus in some parts like they did our stadium to the extent of 10,000 seats, and you may find yourself in this situation. It is most uncomfortable.

[Proposal No. 6 (page A-4) was approved by voice vote.]

Postseason Football Contests

James R. McCoy (Ohio State University): Mr. President and Members of the Association, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 7. [The motion was seconded.]

The intent of the amendment is to require member institutions to operate their athletic programs in accordance with Bylaw 4-6-(b) to be eligible for postseason football competition.

[Proposal No. 7 (page A-4) was approved by voice vote.]

[Ed. NOTE: Proposals No. 8 and No. 9 (pages A-4 and A-5) failed to receive a motion for adoption.]

Freshman Rule

President Cross: We have in this particular matter an overlap problem in that Proposal No. 13 (pages A-6 and A-7) modifies the freshman rule by eliminating that barrier for College Division institutions in all sports. Proposal No. 10 (pages A-5 and A-6) would affect not only College Division but also University Division institutions.

It seems to be the more orderly way — and our parliamentarian agrees—that we take up No. 13 first, and I ask unanimous consent of the Convention to do so. Is there objection to taking No. 13 before No. 10? Hearing none, the item before us at the moment is No. 13.

J. Lewis Comer (California State College, Hayward): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal 13. [The motion was seconded.]

Practically all the College Division members at the present time are using freshmen during the regular season, with the possible exception of some of the colleges in the northeastern section of the country. It seems rather senseless to me that a student can participate on the team all season long and be denied at the end of the season the participation in one game, for instance, the NCAA College Division regional football game or the College Division Basketball Tournament.

Walter L. Hass (University of Chicago): The College Basketball Committee urges the adoption of this regulation. I will go a little further than Lew in saying that it is a great trial and tribulation for the Committees in selecting teams to find two or three you have selected are playing freshman and you have not been notified. It creates a great problem. If you are going to have freshmen eligible, let's have them all the way.

Edgar A. Sherman (Muskingum College): The College Football Committee also asks support of this amendment. We could possibly have in choosing teams identical situations. One team might have an 8-1 record without freshmen. Another team might have a 9-0 record, and two weeks before the selection is made we find the quarterback and three defensive men on the latter team are ineligible. If we don't select them we are wrong and if we do we are wrong.

Roy L. Whistler (Purdue University): Most of the members here know that the Big Ten Conference is strongly opposed to the participation of freshmen in varsity competition in football and basketball. We have many reasons for this. Among those are that we think freshmen ought to get settled before they get into strenuous varsity competition.

You have properly said before that the intercollegiate conferences consist of a variety of schools with a variety of interests, and we firmly believe in that too, so we plan to abstain from this particular vote, since it concerns the College Division. We feel that by doing so we bring about this unanimity of action and purpose that the Association stands for.

Nonetheless, we are going to vote "no" on Proposition No. 10.

William J. Flynn (Boston College): I want to make sure the membership understands that in football sometimes institutions are listed as College Division and they don't have that classification in all sports. An institution may be College Division in football and University Division in basketball. Therefore, if this is voted, institutions which are listed as College Division in football and University Division in basketball would be allowed to play freshmen in football.

There is a great deal of competition between College teams and University teams in basketball, and many people might change their future schedules if the University team finds that this fine College basketball team they have been playing for many years is going to be even better because they are going to use freshmen.

Richard Koppenhaver (North Central Conference): We are quite proud of our conference and we for years have adhered to the NCAA regulations. Two years ago we saw fit, in the interest of squads in football and to eliminate some of the coaching positions in our institutions, to allow freshmen to compete in football and basketball. We found that in this past year it did improve our level of football.

Those of you who follow college football know that North Dakota State University has been perennially among the national powers. We were pleased with the balance of power in the Conference allowing people to have this depth. We recently completed our holiday basketball tournament in which freshmen were playing for the second year. Out of eight schools there were only two freshmen starters, but we had the greatest collection of sophomore talent we ever had.

That is a reflection on the boys getting a sample of varsity competition during the freshman year. We found no difficulty as far as eligibility is concerned.

While I appreciate the position of the gentleman from Purdue, I would like to remind him there are several schools in the Big Ten which allow freshmen to play hockey, which starts the middle of October and runs into the middle of March, overlapping in the quarter system three grading periods and in the semester system, two. Hockey, as you know, is a demanding physical sport and there is a great deal of travel and time away from classes involved.

The football season ends early enough to allow the boys to recover their position academically before final examinations. I don't think that is a legitimate complaint against this particular legislation, and I speak for the members of our Conference in urging you to consider passing this proposal.

President Cross: In accordance with the suggestion of the Long Range Planning Committee, I have encouraged discussion by anyone and everyone who thought he had something to contribute, but this may be one of those situations where the proposed amendment does not have any particular concern to your institution, and it may be you will desire to refrain from voting. I want to be absolutely clear; you have the right to vote, but it may be this is one time you will want to refrain.

I should remind you that it is possible that a team of an institution will have a College classification in one of its sports and another team in another sport in the same institution may have a University classification, without regard to their College or University classification in our hierarchy in the direct sense. This may mean it is not simply merely a College Division question. That, of course, I leave to your individual judgment.

Mr. Comer: I do not believe this legislation applies in any way to a member institution in the University Division. As the rule clearly states, if you are a College Division member, you will have the ability to use freshmen up to the postseason contest. The changing of this rule, in my opinion, would in no way affect the schools in the University Division.

[Proposal No. 13 (pages A-6 and A-7) was approved by voice vote.]

President Cross: We will now return to Item No. 10, the freshmen rule as it applies to all member institutions.

P. R. Theibert (Hofstra University): We presented this for austerity reasons. I listened closely Monday afternoon and thought it was wonderful about the 100 institutions who were not in financial trouble. I can guarantee the other 500 members are on an inescapable austerity toboggan that is going to get worse clear across the campus before it gets better. We propose the rule simply because we can no longer afford a freshman team and a varsity team. If we want football to continue on campus we will have one team. That is not a matter of debate. That is a matter of decision of the trustees of the University.

I may only know the poor people in the room, I hasten to add. I may not know you rich guys. We find we don't have any choice if we want to keep football on campus. We aren't going to tell the freshmen, "We don't have a freshman team; you can't play." We are not going to say, "Sit around here, Son." We are going to say, "Come on out." We want to use him in games if we can. We would like to see this rule passed so we can do it without causing all kinds of trouble, and stay within the rule. If not, we will have to do it on a one-to-one basis with other universities.

This is the only way we will start to get any legislation which recognizes the differences in universities and colleges throughout the country. It is one basic way realistically we can get the financial laws in line.

If you look at the people we are not allowed to talk about here who are not colleges or universities, but who have very financially sound athletic programs at the professional level, their rules make a great deal of sense. This is the first step toward getting a lot of us back on our feet financially.

I move the adoption of Proposal No. 10. [The motion was seconded.]

J. William Davis (Texas Tech University): Mr. President, I think the University people generally abstained from voting on the College Division motion, and I suggest this is primarily a matter of University Division concern. Having voted on the College Division rule, the College Division members should abstain.

President Cross: Thank you, Mr. Davis. You said it better than I was going to say it. [Laughter]

Frank Leftwich (Tuskegee Institute): I recall last year at the Convention the hockey people made a similar plea. If we are going to make a separation on the basis of colleges and universities, are we going to make a separation on those sports that some schools do not offer, such as lacrosse? It seems to me this might set a precedent.

President Cross: I respond to you in this way: That is essentially what the Long Range Planning Committee suggested and what the Council agreed was wise. We in fact do not split on College-University lines; we split on sports lines. This particular issue happens to split between colleges and universities. In the present posture everyone has the right to vote. The suggestion of the Long Range Planning Committee, which struggled so long with the possibility of a bicameral organization, and concluded that was undesirable, was that perhaps this could accommodate the situation when those who are primarily concerned wish to make the decision with the least interference from

those who are not concerned or who are experts on ice hockey, like Bill Davis from Texas Tech is. [Laughter]

[Proposal No. 10 (pages A-5 and A-6) was defeated by vote of 102-113.]

Axel C. Bundgaard (St. Olaf College): Now that Item 13 has been passed, and according to the rules of the NCAA any legislation passed here becomes effective August 1, is there any opportunity that Item 13 might be implemented before that date?

President Cross: It was the understanding a year ago when we moved the effective date to August 1 for legislation, that if it was desired by motion to fix a date other than that, either immediately or some other fixed date, it would be permissible.

Mr. Bundgaard: Mr. Chairman, I move that Item 13 be made effective immediately. [The motion was seconded.]

Andrew Mooradian (University of New Hampshire): I am a little confused as to who makes the decision whether you are College Division or University Division in football. I know we declare whether we are going College or University Division in other sports.

Charles M. Neinas (NCAA Assistant Executive Director): The Association sponsors 26 national championships. It sponsors nine national championships which are expressly for the College Division. In those sports in which the Association offers two national championships, the institution through the process of self-determination indicates whether it wishes to be classified in the College or the University Division.

In the matter of football, selection for the Association's College Division Regional Football Championships is determined by the classification of the institution by the Football Statistics and Classification Committee. There are 118 institutions classified major. There are approximately 325 institutions listed as College Division for the sport of football. Regardless of an institution's determination as it applies to those sports in which the institution offers two national championships, the Football Classification Committee listing determines eligibility for the College Division regional program for football.

P. R. Theibert (Hofstra University): I interpret that the University of New Hampshire can play freshmen on the varsity. Is that correct?

Mr. Neinas: Regular season eligibility is established by the institution and/or its conference. We are speaking only of eligibility for NCAA championship competition. The University of New Hampshire, a member of the Yankee Conference, is in the University Division in basketball through self-determination. Therefore, if its team is selected for the University Basketball Tournament its freshmen would not be eligible. The institution is classified College Division in the sport of football. If it is selected for the Boardwalk Bowl its freshmen would be eligible.

[The motion to make Proposal No. 13 (pages A-6 and A-7) effective immediately was approved by voice vote.]

Basketball Playing Season

John W. Winkin (Colby College): Mr. President, I apologize that through some misunderstanding Proposal No. 9 was not offered, I feel, as president of the ECAC, that it should be offered at this time. There-

fore, I move, Mr. Chairman, that the Proposal No. 9 be approved. [The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and defeated.]

Freshman Rule

Harry Troxell (Colorado State University): I move that we reconsider Proposal No. 10 through a ballot vote. [The motion was seconded.]

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. President, a point of order. Was the motion to reconsider made by one who voted on the prevailing side?

President Cross: In a convention where you cannot tell who voted for what, the preferable rule is it doesn't make any difference, and I so rule. [Laughter]

Paul Masoner (University of Pittsburgh): Mr. Chairman, before we vote on this motion to reconsider, I would like to question a point that has been made several times and which represents a very dangerous move for this organization. It has been said that if we are in the University Division we should vote only on matters relating directly to the University Division, and if we are in the College Division we should vote only on those issues relating to the College Division.

This could, as you have indicated, be carried to the various sports. It seems to me that we either are a single organization, the NCAA, or we ought to become a variety of different organizations.

The matters which come before this Convention are important to the total membership, and so, without indicating a stand on this motion, it is important for every one of us, if we believe that this is an important and a single organization, to be prepared to vote on every issue.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 10 was defeated by voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 11 (page A-6) was withdrawn without dissent.]

Alien Student-Athletes

Adolph W. Samborski (Harvard University): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 12, which would amend Article 4, Section 1-(f)-(2) of the Bylaws by striking the word "twentieth" and inserting "nineteenth." [The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this amendment is to lower the age under which alien student-athletes may compete in their own country without the loss of collegiate eligibility in this country.

This deals with eligibility rules for NCAA events only. It does not concern in-season competition.

This amendment is supported by the Council and the NCAA Special Committee on Ice Hockey. This does cover all sports, but undoubtedly there is a great stress paid in this particular item to hockey. The NCAA Special Committee on Ice Hockey supports this unanimously, the reason being that lowering the age to 19 would discourage the recruiting of older Canadian hockey players and so provide greater opportunities for United States citizens to participate in American intercollegiate hockey. There are many institutions who are very concerned about the increasing number of foreign-born athletes in college ice hockey programs in this country.

Ralph Romano (University of Minnesota, Duluth): I would like to draw attention to Amendment B. We would like to have the proposal

amended to read: "except that an individual whose nineteenth birthday is on or after December 1 may complete the season of competition in his sport which is in progress or starts on December 1." [The motion was seconded.]

The reason for this is that in 1967 the Western Collegiate Hockey Association self-imposed a 19-year-old rule. We lived with it for a year and ran into problems.

We asked young men to quit their teams in March or April, toward the end of the season with a game or two remaining. I don't think any of us agree with that kind of recruiting. We also created by this act a great deal of ill will in the community where these young men were playing. After one year, we imposed the December 1 date and found it very workable.

Robert M. Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Conference and chairman of the Special NCAA Ice Hockey Committee): Although the Committee was not given an opportunity to completely review and evaluate this amendment, I would like to call to the attention of the membership that when the NCAA Ice Hockey Committee recommended No. 12 we were including all sports, not just hockey. In hockey, we would like to equate the age relative to our graduating high school senior, presently about 17 years, nine months now, with the older foreign student-athlete coming into our colleges. In Canada, hockey starts very early in the fall and runs through April. Any boy turning 19 during this particular period would not be effected or lose a year of eligibility.

As I analyze this situation, you are really only taking the 20th birthday and putting it down to 19 and six months. As a member of the Committee, I would oppose that.

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): We are wholly in favor of any legislation which will tend to equalize the competitive opportunities between alien students and American students and which will encourage greater participation and opportunities for American students. There are many student-athletes being imported in all sports and this situation is likely to get out of hand.

Also, we are highly in favor of legislation which will tend to equalize the age and the physical development in contact sports between foreign students and American students, particularly foreign students who have had an opportunity for competitive experience in many more games. Minnesota high school students are restricted to twenty games a season, whereas in Canada they play about fifty games.

If Mr. Romano's amendment is adopted, this would in fact bring about only a slight lowering of the age. This would not be a very serious situation in comparison with the disadvantages which he has pointed out.

However, I urge the Council and the Committee to continue to study this and perhaps develop further modifications to be considered by the Convention.

Inasmuch as this legislation applies to all sports, I encourage the Council to consult representatives of other sports.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a ruling from the Chair. If the amendment proposed by the Council, or the amendment to the amendment proposed by Mr. Romano carries, does either apply to

students who are matriculated in the institution?

President Cross: Mr. Schultze, the answer to your question is this: The ordinary interpretation given to our changes is that if it works to the advantage of the young man, the change is available to him. If it works to his disadvantage, it is not. This would work to the disadvantage of the student. In other words, he would have a year taken away from him conceivably that was not taken away from him before he arrived and therefore this would not apply.

Leo Miles (Howard University): Mr. Chairman, we strongly oppose the proposed amendment, simply because what may be good for hockey is not necessarily good for all other sports that alien students participate in.

[Amendment B to Proposal No. 12 was defeated by voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 12 (page A-6) was approved by voice vote.]

Walvers

Samuel E. Barnes (Howard University): Mr. President, I move we amend Article 4, Section 3, of the Bylaws by adding paragraph (d). [The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to enable an institution which has had its squad decimated by accident or illness to appeal for a waiver of portions of Bylaw 4-1 and 4-2 in order to complete its regular playing season without penalty to freshmen who thereby compete on the varsity team or to those students involved in the disaster who have eligibility remaining.

[Proposal No. 14 (page A-7) was approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Institutional Eligibility for NCAA Events

Arthur W. Nebel (University of Missouri): Mr. Chairman, Item No. 15 amends Bylaw 4, Section 6. I move its adoption. [The motion was seconded.]

The bold-faced type in this item substantiates the reasoning for this change. The intent is to clarify that the NCAA recognizes penalties imposed by allied conferences which are designed to prohibit institutions from entering NCAA competition.

[Proposal No. 15 (page A-7) was approved by voice vote.]

1.600 Rule

Robert Tierney (Queens College): Mr. Chairman, I move the approval of Proposal No. 16. [The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this legislation is to abolish the 1.600 rule. The further intent is not a lowering of academic standards of any kind, but rather an attempt to abolish legislation which is no longer relevant. Many colleges today find themselves in a position where this particular rule is not relevant. In some instances because of sociological changes taking place throughout the country, they find they cannot conform to this any more.

It is for those reasons that we suggest these changes.

John Winklin (Colby College): Some of you will recognize that when this legislation was originally presented we offered opposition to it, principally on the basis that it complicates or interferes with the prin-

ciple of Article 3, Section 2, of the NCAA Constitution.

I have tried as best I could to live by the philosophy and intent of this legislation and do not argue in any way with the philosophy of this legislation, but during the time that we have had to live with this legislation, institutional autonomy has diminished.

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): On behalf of both the Council and the Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements, I would like to urge strongly that the Convention defeat Proposal No. 16.

As many of you recognize, the 1.600 rule has been one of the most significant pieces of legislation in recent years. The basic reasons for its enactment still exist, the basic concept being that when we meet in NCAA championship events, we can all say our competing teams are representative of our student body. That principle is still being adhered to.

The passage of this amendment would be a severe blow to inter-collegiate athletics. We do honestly believe the student-athlete is a student first. There is evidence that it has been a workable, although a very complicated rule. There is hope in my mind that it will help in the relocation of students in an academic environment more suitable to their abilities and preparation. It is very valuable that a man approaches the registration office first, rather than the gymnasium.

I urge the Convention to defeat this amendment.

J. William Davis (Texas Tech University): Mr. President, I feel compelled to bare my soul before the Convention, in the light of the fact that for several years I was an ardent opponent of this legislation. I have had a change of heart. I have come to be an advocate of the 1.600 legislation. It has accomplished some of its purposes, not all of them probably, but some of them. It has been a very salutary program.

I call your attention to the fact that there will be a bit of legislation proposed later that also has to do with the 1.600 rule, and I urge that this particular motion be defeated.

George A. Hansell (PMC Colleges): Mr. President, I supported this legislation five years ago and now I feel just the opposite, compelled to vote against it. Disadvantaged students are seeking our college. They take the entrance examinations and they do not do well. They do not predict 1.600. Therefore, we cannot talk to them about coming to college, or participating in athletics, or offer them aid under our present rule.

This seems to be discriminatory because these tests are not really valid for this group.

A study was made by the Ford Foundation at Brown University which revealed that students classified as academic risks go on to perform just as well as their better-qualified classmates in many situations.

A report from a Philadelphia paper said: "In investigating the further careers of 2100 students over a period of time researchers came to the following conclusions: Risk students complete their undergraduate courses almost as often as high college board scorers. Although a bit less likely to be admitted to graduate school, they do as well there as other students. Risks are just as likely to achieve career success as other students."

The Brown University report concludes that the additional criteria of college admissions, namely college board scorers and high grades,

do not present the whole picture. Equally important is motivation.

One implication of this study is that traditional admissions requirements can be lowered without seriously affecting academic standards, despite what critics of open admissions have urged.

Therefore, with these changing times, realizing our present tests are not valid for foreign students or ghetto-type disadvantaged students, we should repeal this legislation.

John Larson (University of Southern California): There is an old admonition about not throwing out the baby with the bath water. I certainly recognize the difficulties with respect to the administration of the 1.600 rule which have been presented here, but it is a far more positive stand on the part of the Convention to attempt to look at other means of making the 1.600 rule enforceable in the current environment in which we find ourselves, rather than retreating in disarray and repealing legislation which has a noble meaning to it.

Therefore, I urge that the Convention defeat Proposal No. 16.

Paul Masoner (University of Pittsburgh): We can talk a great deal about noble motives, but if we have current legislation which works to the disadvantage of a very significant number of our people, it is inconceivable that we should retain such legislation.

There has been an opportunity over a period of years to bring about changes. I have not seen any real change in the procedures for determining eligibility under the 1.600 rule, therefore, I would urge that we eliminate the 1.600 legislation.

Mr. Chapman: As chairman of the Academic Testing and Requirements Committee, although I have only been in office 12 days [laughter], I would like to point out that the deficiencies in the present system are uppermost in the minds of our Committee. We are working with the SAT and the ACT people on schemes whereby the inequities can be removed from our system. I guarantee that we will continue to so work.

Stanley J. Marshall (South Dakota University): I would like to present a majority report from the College Committee. We discussed this matter at length on Sunday and by a vote of 6-1-2 we agreed to support the principle of continuing the 1.600 rule. Therefore, the majority of the College Committee urges that this Convention reject this motion.

Ray Klivecka (City College of New York): In the final analysis, any legislation that restricts the students' participation has to be eliminated.

Joseph Owens (New Paltz State University College): I urge the delegates to pass this proposal. We do not use SAT for admission standards. High school guidance counselors are reluctant, if they know a boy has been recruited or been invited to apply at two or three different schools, to use grade point average. This presents a tremendous problem.

Foreign students have no SAT test scores. This is another problem. We have a lot of walk-in foreign students by virtue of our proximity to New York City and also by virtue of our curriculum.

I know there are other testing measures, but it is almost impossible to get a decent prediction. Students accepted on Equal Opportunity programs or open admissions are bona fide students in everything except athletics. I feel the NCAA is mandating institutional eligibility.

We are not a high-powered recruiting school, and we cannot get students to answer questionnaires as to whether or not they have taken the SAT. By the time we check this we are, in reality, hypocrites. I am satiated with telling a student that he does not project a 1.600. He doesn't know what it means when he comes to our campus.

Charles Tobey (Brooklyn College): We are finding in the City University of New York that there are many, many students who are not taking college boards because we do not require them, but they are doing very well in school when they get in.

A lot of talk has come out today about disadvantaged students and changing sociological positions. We are all in this business of athletic administration because it is a worthwhile activity and educational benefit to the students. We should be trying to promote participation, not denying participation. If we are going to spout forth the ideals of athletics and the way it can build character and build personality, we should think about the students coming into colleges today and what athletics can do for them.

The present legislation denies participation in a very worthwhile activity. It is very important to abolish this legislation.

Mr. Chapman: Mr. Chairman, in Item 17 there is the first attempt to make some accommodation for these students. It is very important that we be sure these young men do not become exploited merely because they are athletic talents.

[Proposal No. 16 (page A-8) was defeated by voice vote.]

Definition of Student-Athlete

President Cross: We have one of those sequence complications at this point. A significant part of the pattern developed by the Council is the modification of O.I. 100, which appears as Item 31. It would be useful to the Convention if we were to act on that before we act on Item 17, and I will ask the unanimous consent of the Convention to do so. Hearing no objection, we will turn then to Item 31 (page A-15).

The purpose of this revision of Official Interpretation 100 is to identify the principal types of recruiting activity which the Council feels should classify the prospective student as a prospective student-athlete and to identify the sort of conduct which should not place the prospective student in the category of student-athlete.

You will notice the principal recruiting activities are listed under (a) and such solicitation of the student would classify him as a student-athlete.

On the other hand, the normal courtesies of an unplanned conversation with the student—in the Southwest Conference they call them bumps, and in the Pacific-8 Conference they call them casuals—would be categorized with the general mail circulation of information with reference to a university and asking persons if they have some interest in the athletic program.

The second item under (b) includes, of course, the ordinary form from which our recruiters make their preliminary determination as to which ones they should actively recruit.

It is the belief of the Council that this O.I. would provide a set of rules with which our recruiters can honestly live, whereas the really quite rigid rules we have had up to this time can at times make recruiting activities almost hypocritical.

[The motion was regularly made and seconded that Proposal No. 31 be approved.]

Edwin H. Cady (Indiana University): Mr. Chairman, I move that Proposal No. 31 for purposes of voting be divided. It seems to me much of what you have said in that very good speech applies to paragraph (a), but there are certain great difficulties about paragraph (b).

I am much encouraged by the tendency in (a) to say rather concretely what we are talking about as recruitment activity. I am unhappy at the rather vague language of (b) and the failure of it to consider a good many of the activities or difficulties, whichever way one might wish to put it, which are normally associated with recruitment. [The motion was seconded.]

President Cross: It is undesirable—permissible but undesirable—to divide the vote because while Mr. Cady is correct that (b) has some greater vagueness than (a), this area of recruiting is a pretty vague thing. I am not sure anybody could devise workable language that is extremely precise. It would be undesirable to have only one and not both.

[The motion to divide the voting was defeated by voice vote.]

Charles Oldfather (University of Kansas): I move the adoption of Amendment D to Proposal No. 31. [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not consider this an earth-shaking amendment, but merely one for the purpose of clarification. As you have stated, O.I. 100 contains a proposed amendment of the rules as to what constitutes recruitment. I do not believe there is any other significant place in the Bylaws or in the Official Interpretations where these are stated. It seems to me that paragraph (a)-(3) must include in recruiting initiating contact with a prospective student. I find it quite difficult to see why this should be limited to initiating telephone contact or why if you initiate personal contact, face-to-face, that should not be included.

President Cross: The Council is not in favor of Amendment D for this reason: If this becomes "arranges any contact" it will knock out (2) in paragraph (b), "requests via mail a prospective student or a member of his family to complete and return a questionnaire."

Contacts other than telephone contact in the judgment of the Council are adequately covered by (4) "visits or entertains a prospective student."

The telephone contact was included at the wisdom of one of the athletic directors who worked in drafting this language. His story is that, "Our people say they do not do any recruiting, but you ought to look at their telephone bills."

[Amendment D to Proposal No. 31 was defeated by voice vote.]

Robley Williams (University of California, Berkeley): Mr. Chairman, anyone knows whenever he reads anything about what the Supreme Court is doing that the problem of defining terms is unending and very difficult.

We have two paragraphs; (a) and (b). One of them is a set of items such that if the action specified takes place this constitutes recruiting. There is a second set of items which are such that if these are done it is not considered recruiting.

Should one take the items under (a) as exclusive? If these actions take place then this is recruiting, and there is no hidden implication

that if something other than what is in (a) is done it is also recruiting, but it wasn't listed?

Now, more importantly, however, I want to speak to the non-exclusivity in character of (b). Does (b) describe all the actions, which if they take place, do not constitute recruiting?

May a recruiter via mail—under (b)-(2)—point out to the student, or may he point out to him during his normal contact, but preferably through the mail, that there is an Office of Economic Opportunity or an EOP program on the campus?

It is not provided for, but that is perfectly all right if we consider that the items under (b) are not exclusive and the items under (a) are exclusive. With that provision I would certainly be in favor of the motion.

President Cross: I think, Mr. Williams, I would have to conclude that the items under neither (a) nor (b) are exclusive. They are essentially specifications and beyond that we have an expression of spirit or purpose. It would be unwise to try to identify everything, because I don't know who could remember all of them.

It is anticipated that there may be some change in customs and patterns of recruiting, but they will go to the registrar's office first rather than the gymnasium, and by one means or another get some reasonable idea of a young man's eligibility. If they conclude he is not eligible, about the most you could say to him would be, "I am sorry, but your record suggests you are not eligible for intercollegiate athletics under the rules I must apply. If you are interested in coming to our university there is, of course, a program that some people who have this kind of record may use to get into the institution," and then retreat. So he can fairly say he has given information in a reasonable fashion, not as an active recruiter.

I recognize that can be a fairly fine line, but it is something that can be lived with, by those who are willing to live with it.

C. R. Gilstrap (University of Texas, Arlington): In regard to the questionnaire, may the student be asked to answer regarding his high school record and might this form include questions as to his athletic prowess?

President Cross: Yes. This was created by the practice of one of the coaches in the East who has a large mailing list of all the high school men within reasonable geographic limitations. He sends out this basic athletic questionnaire to all of them as his first step to find out whether he wants to recruit them.

Mr. Gilstrap: This would not be regarded as contacting him to sign him as a student-athlete?

President Cross: It would be an exception as outlined in paragraph (b)-(2).

Walter Versen (University of Illinois, Chicago Circle): The chairman of our athletic committee happens to be director of our Educational Assistance Program. Does this make all our students recruited by the Educational Assistance Program, which is the only recruitment in subsidization that goes on on our campus?

President Cross: This is a hard question, but the answer would be: Is his contacting for the general purposes of that program, or primarily to induce them to engage in varsity intercollegiate athletics?

Mr. Versen: Who is to say?

President Cross: If somebody challenges you, maybe the Infractions Committee or the Council will have to determine the answer. It is a question of the good faith of the operation rather than the details. [Proposal No. 31 (page A-15) was approved by voice vote.]

1.600 Rule

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Council I would like to put Item No. 17 before the Convention. [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment C (page A-10). [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the impact of Item 17, should it pass, is really more contained in the revision of O.I. 100 which we just approved.

Under the present 1.600 legislation, if a student was athletically recruited in terms of O.I. 100 and received institutional aid in any form, including OEO and similar programs, the application of the 1.600 rule presumptively assumed the aid was athletically related. The institution was required to declare the boy ineligible, if he did not predict 1.600, in order to maintain its institutional eligibility.

The proposed changes will still apply essentially to what I have just described to you. However, if he is not athletically recruited, a student will be able to receive that aid, but he would not be allowed to practice and participate until he spent two semesters and achieved a 1.600. The mere acceptance of the aid would not make him ineligible as is provided under the present legislation.

There is, however, the requirement that proper certification by the university officials be made that such special award was not made with athletic ability involved.

The present language refers to the student-athlete rather than to the institution. This amendment attempts to plug the loop hole. It is not related to the economically-deprived individual.

Under the present legislation, if your institution uses the national tables, a nonpredictor, whether he is recruited or not, could enter your institution without receiving aid, not practice or participate, earn a 0.5 average, and compete the next year.

A student on your campus, not receiving aid, under the present legislation would become eligible with a 0.0 average. The proposed change would require the boy to make 1.600 in two semesters. If he does that he can receive any form of aid and be free to participate.

[Amendment C (page A-10) to Proposal No. 17 was approved by voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 17 (pages A-8 and A-9), as amended, was approved by voice vote.]

Mr. Chapman: Mr. President, in view of the timeliness of this accommodation on the 1.600, I move that it become effective immediately.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

Warren Schmakel (Boston University): Gentlemen, we at Boston University have felt for some time that a nonpredictor whose parents have the financial wherewithal to pay his way is being penalized by the 1.600 rule because he is not able to participate in athletics after one semester. By the same token, the underprivileged boy from a different social-economic level whose parents could not really afford

to send him to school, but through their own hard work, managed to start him in college, is being penalized. We feel he becomes a second-class citizen.

I made a phone call yesterday to verify the grades of a couple of students. Both were non-predictors. One student received a 2.7 average and the other received a 2.9 average.

I feel these individuals should not be penalized for the second semester, therefore, I move that we amend Article 4, Section 6-(b)-(1), as stated in Proposal No. 18. [The motion was seconded.]

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): I oppose, on behalf of the Council and the University, Item No. 18. Proposal No. 17 just passed takes care of the individual who was not athletically recruited. He is going to be able to get aid. What this would do would be to allow people to become eligible during the second semester.

Many of us feel that if a person wished he could find enough classes for an individual to get 12 hours of rather unsubstantial work and be eligible after one semester. It is more difficult if he has to perform at that level for at least a year.

I urge that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. Schmakel: I take issue with that particular statement. Most institutions have a guidance or curriculum director and the course requirements would not permit a student to arrange a schedule like that.

[Proposal No. 18 (page A-10) was defeated by voice vote.]

Transfers of Membership

Edward Caress (George Washington University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 19 (page A-10) to amend Article 6, Section 4-(c), as indicated.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

George Smith (University of Cincinnati): Mr. Chairman, I move Item No. 20 (page A-11) to amend Article 6, Section 4, transferring the University of Cincinnati from District Five to District Four.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

Robert Otto (Mankato State College): I move that Bylaw Article 6, Section 4, be amended as in Proposal No. 21 (page A-11) and Mankato State College be moved from District 4 to District 5.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

Committees

Frank F. Carver (University of Pittsburgh): Mr. Chairman, I move that Article 7, Section 2, be amended as indicated in Proposal No. 22 (pages A-11 and A-12). [The motion was seconded.]

The reasons are simply as expressed, to formalize the Association's promotional activities.

[The motion was approved by voice vote.]

Rules Committees

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): Mr. President and Members of the Association: On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 23, amending Article 7, Section 3-(a)-(1), of the Bylaws. [The motion was seconded.]

Gentlemen, I approach this proposal with some trepidation. Last

year, a similar proposal was made before this Association and it was defeated.

As you will recall, last year the proposed change provided basically that the Executive Committee could review proposed rules and if it found them improper for financial or administrative reasons, the rules could be suspended, revoked or set aside.

The Council felt that one of the reasons this was defeated was that it gave too much power to the Executive Committee, so the Council sought to change the proposal to meet that objection. Instead of giving the Executive Committee power to revoke or suspend a rule, that power was reserved for the Council, which contains the elected representatives of this Association and who we feel are directly responsible to you as members of the Association.

Under the present NCAA structure, the Association acting in its annual meeting has the power not only to revoke or suspend rules of play enacted by a rules committee but the Association, acting in Convention, may actively create new rules of play.

If you will look at Article 6 of the Constitution you will notice that is one of the powers which this Association has.

The Council seeks by this amendment to provide an orderly manner of review of the playing rules when they are questioned for financial or administrative reasons. There is no intention in this amendment to substitute the judgment of the Executive Committee or of the Council for the judgment of a rules committee unless there is some financial or administrative reason to review the rules.

At the present time there is no orderly process to accomplish this with a rules committee. All other committees of the NCAA are subject to review by the Council or by the Executive Committee. There has been little ill effect when the review procedure by the Council or the Executive Committee takes place.

The Executive Committee and the Council of this Association recognize that the rules committees are composed of extremely dedicated men who have served long in their sports and who desire to serve in the best interest of the various sports. The Executive Committee and the Council also have the same desire: To serve the NCAA and to serve the sports they are responsible for, so I don't believe there is any conflict in our desire to help this organization.

There was some argument last year that this proposal would take away from the rules committees a certain autonomy which they had maintained in the past. This autonomy is one of practice, but it is not specified in the Constitution and Bylaws of this Association. Because the rules committees are not autonomous, they must answer to this Association as the rest of us must.

I urge your adoption of this amendment.

John Waldorf (Big Eight Conference): I am deeply concerned about this controversial amendment. I use the word controversial because last year a similar amendment was defeated on the floor of this convention by the vote of 214 to 84.

There is very deep feeling on this matter among the many people of this excellent organization, and I am afraid that the passage of this amendment, when the Convention already has the right to propose rules, is just adding fuel to the fire and could very well lead to unrest in our organization.

The first Football Rules Committee was formed in 1876. In December 1906, 40 collegiate institutions got together to form this organization. At that time, it was decided that the playing rules be handled by one committee and the eligibility rules by the other, because they were not the same. From that day until this, and if my mathematics are correct that is some 65 years, we have had the committee form of government in which the rules committees and other NCAA committees, all duly elected by this body, work hand-in-hand.

Now we are being asked to pass legislation that will give back again the final word on all existing or new rules to those who have done such an excellent job in the eligibility field.

We are all dedicated. The Council is dedicated. The rules committee are dedicated. We would be making a mistake if we passed this legislation in these troubled times.

Last year, this legislation was presented and characterized as an action that would lock the barn door before the horse was stolen. Let's do better than that. Rather than lock the barn door before the horse is stolen, let's not buy this horse.

Anthony Morella (American University): The fundamental difference between this proposal and the proposal presented last year, which was substantially rejected, is that in this year's proposal there is the incorporation of criteria under which actions of a rules committee would be considered, those criteria being administrative and financial considerations.

I submit, however, that those criteria are significantly broad. As a matter of fact, they are too broad to warrant any precise definition and for the most part unsatisfactory to the house.

Mr. Chairman, I seek the indulgence of the body at this time to perhaps pursue a tangent which is related to this very question.

I call attention to the revised Constitution and Bylaws in particular to the foreword therein, referring to a resolution adopted by this body last year. That resolution empowered the Council to recodify, reorganize and revise the Constitution and Bylaws. There were provisions for its circularization and provisions for its effective date, namely August 1, 1971.

Chairman Young and Mr. Spry have done a tremendous job, and perhaps many of us are at fault in not attending to this earlier in that we have had these materials in our hands since September.

Does that resolution empower the Council, in proposing a total revision of our Constitution and Bylaws, to make substantive changes?

I cannot point out with specificity the substantive changes that have been incorporated in the Constitution and Bylaws and by silence will be adopted, effective August 1, 1971, but they are there and some of them affect rules committees, membership and length of terms.

Mr. Chairman, I solicit a ruling of the Chair as to whether or not the legislative history of the resolution adopted last year empowered the Council to make substantive changes. There has been some effort to point them out, but for the most part they are very difficult to find.

If that be the case, would it be the sense of this body to solicit from the Council in the months ahead specific itemization of the substantive changes that have been made under the devise of revising the Constitution and Bylaws, so that at the very least those which may be very well questionable to the entire house, could be brought out again next

year, even though they may be effective between August and our next annual meeting?

President Cross: The last part of your inquiry is not proper. You can restate by motion, if you wish.

To the first part, the answer is yes. As I explained the resolution to the Convention last year, it did authorize the Council to revise substantively if it desired. We assured you it would be advised by the presentation of those cases where there was substantive revision.

As regards Proposal No. 23 now before you, that point was discussed at some length at the Council. Some were willing to put this change before us now in the revision to be duly noted by the notes on the opposite page. The Council felt that was a change of such substance it could not be handled that way, but should come to the Convention as an amendment of the then existing rules.

To the question of whether there are substantive changes which are not pointed out, the answer is no. There are very few substantive changes which the Council felt were of major consequence and the Council in its wisdom decided not to use the power given by the resolution at the last Convention.

Mr. Morella: Your ruling I take it is that last year's resolution empowered the Council to make substantive changes as opposed to technical changes?

President Cross: Yes.

Mr. Morella: The Council has spelled out some of those amendments for action at this meeting. The others which the Council felt to be less important will be adopted automatically.

President Cross: No. The power was exercised by the Council under the resolution. The revised Constitution and Bylaws are proposed for amendment at this Convention. They are not before us for action now. They are effective August 1, 1971. The particular proposal before us now is one which proposes to amend the revised Constitution and Bylaws, which will be our operating document on August 1, 1971.

Richard Koenig (Valparaiso University): I would like to return to the basic question and re-enforce what Professor Swank mentioned and perhaps correct a comment by the gentleman from the American University.

The basic change lies in procedure. We have added, to be more consistent with practices which exist in all other committees, the provision that the Council take action and then the annual Convention has the right to either approve or disapprove.

With your indulgence, I would like to quote from the report which I presented on behalf of the Council at Monday's business session on this matter. It emphasizes the fact that we have established a definite procedure.

"Please note that this year's amendment provides that if the Executive Committee, after consultation with the rules committee involved determines that a rule is not appropriate for financial or other administrative reasons, the Executive Committee may recommend to the Council that such a rule be revoked or suspended. The Council will then receive the opinions of the rules committee and the Executive Committee and may make a decision to either revoke or suspend the rule or deny the Executive Committee's request for reconsideration.

"Remember that Council actions are subject to review by the membership. This amendment is designed to require the rules committees to come under the same system of checks and balances as are all other committees of the Association. We do not feel that this is unreasonable, nor do we feel that it is an infringement upon the traditional operation of the Association's various rules committees.

"In summary, we do not believe that any committee of the NCAA should have a separate, autonomous role, removed from review by the institutions which hold membership in the NCAA."

Edward Steitz (Springfield College): I see no difference whatsoever in the thrust or the clout of this proposal and the proposition which was voted down by three to one last year. This proposal indicates that the consultation will take place afterwards. If we have a problem with any rules committee we should be forthright and say, "This is the committee we are after." I would rather see our problems resolved beforehand. Let's have the consultation before any rule changes take place.

I have been privileged to serve on the Basketball Rules Committee for the past 17 years. I know of no more dedicated group in this Association. It represents 400 years of direct responsibility in the sport of basketball. These people know what they are talking about. They have always heeded the advice of the Council members, the Executive Committee, or any other group that is concerned with the sport of basketball.

Another weakness in this proposed amendment is the phrase, "or other administrative reasons." That is a pretty blank check. Many things can be brought into that: Throw out the disqualification rule or throw out the dribble rule because it is going to bring in more people or less people. I would like to have a definition before I can vote on it favorably. That is why I am speaking against it.

I appreciate the fact that we need checks and balances over the playing rules. I have a great deal of respect for the Council. The people on the Council are learned men, but they had better get 19 different rule books to determine whether or not playing rules "are not appropriate for financial or other administrative reasons."

Mr. Swank: I don't believe the Council or the Executive Committee is "after" any committee.

Mr. Waldorf made one of the most telling arguments in favor of this amendment. He said in these troublesome times we don't need this amendment. If we are in troubled times, and some of us feel we may be, perhaps if a rule is questioned for administrative or financial reasons, we need a procedure to be followed rather than have it be done on a case-by-case, will-of-the-wisp basis. This proposal outlines a way for the Executive Committee or the Council to do this. The Council and the Executive Committee do not wish to read each rule book to try to second-guess the rules committees. That is not the purpose of this rule.

Mr. Waldorf commented on the committee form of government. This rule would follow the normal committee form of government in that there is someone for each committee to answer to.

Mr. Steitz said there were 400 years of experience on the Basketball Rules Committee. I haven't tallied up how many years' experience

exists on the Council or the Executive Committee in financial or administrative matters affecting institutions of higher learning, but there are a couple of years there also. We are all really dedicated to the job. This is a housecleaning amendment to establish the procedure for the revision of a rule in the event it is felt, only for financial or administrative reasons, to be inappropriate.

The Council and this Association would decide what administrative means, but we are not talking about the rules of the play—the dribble or pass interference. I don't see how that can be considered administrative. I believe a rather strict construction would be given to those terms.

David Nelson (University of Delaware): If we add this amendment, we have to leave out the preliminary statement [in Bylaw 7-3-(a)-(1)] that the rules committees are responsible for establishing and maintaining rules. If the Executive Committee and the Council are going to be able to revoke or suspend these rules, then we cannot be responsible for establishing rules.

Rules are made, at least on the Football Rules Committee, first, for safety; second, to apply to all institutions; third, to be coachable; fourth, to keep a balance between offense and defense; and fifth, to have a game that is interesting to the spectators.

If we have in our minds that financial and administrative reasons are the reasons that we have changes in the football rules, then we are not going to have the best possible game for the students.

I do not believe this amendment was voted down last year because the system was not adequate or because there was not an appellate situation which we now have. It was voted down on principle.

If there is going to be a review of all rules committees, it should not be limited to administrative reasons or financial reasons. The rules should be reviewed for all reasons.

We are being tried for the same crime twice. If we went to a 3 to 1 vote last year to win, something must have happened in the meantime to bring this proposal to the floor again. How have the rules committees been delinquent? We have the best football teams we have had and the best basketball teams we have had. We have the greatest home count in football television, and in both sports we have the highest attendance we have ever had. If the committees have been delinquent it should be pointed out to us what has happened that we need these administrative procedures.

As far as checks and balances are concerned, perhaps it would be better in some respects if they were within the organization. The checks and balances always end up in one place.

[Proposal No. 23 (page A-12) was defeated by voice vote.]

Dwight T. Reed (Lincoln University, Mo.): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Item No. 24 (pages A-12 and A-13) which amends Bylaw 7, Section 3-(a). [The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this legislation is to require a minimum number of a district's membership to sponsor a sport in order to be represented on a rules committee.

[The motion was approved by voice vote.]

Louis Myers (University of Arizona): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 25 (page A-13) which amends Bylaw Article 7, Section 3-(f). [The motion was seconded.]

I believe the changes indicated are more or less self-explanatory. The intent is to add two members to the Swimming Rules Committee; one with expertise in diving and one who shall represent junior college swimming interests. This proposal has been supported by the Committee itself.

[The motion was approved by voice vote.]

Mr. Myers: Mr. President, in order to gain maximum benefit from this amendment, I move that it become effective immediately.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

Richard Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Council I move the adoption of Proposal No. 26 (page A-13) which will amend Article 7, Section 3-(g) of the Bylaws. [The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to implement the provisions approved in Proposal No. 24.

[The motion was approved by voice vote.]

Mr. Koenig: Mr. Chairman, to obtain maximum benefit, I move that the action be made effective immediately.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

9. REVIEW OF INTERPRETATIONS

Ice Hockey Eligibility

Adolph W. Samborski (Harvard University): Mr. Chairman, Proposal No. 27 has some deletions and insertions. The four words, "Canadian Amateur Hockey Association" both in line 2 and line 5, are deleted and "a foreign country" is substituted. In line 4, the word "a" is deleted and there is inserted "any ice hockey." In line 7 there appears the words "educational expenses." This is an insertion, but I would like to point out that those two words have always been in the hockey affidavit which has been in the Manual.

Also at the bottom of the body of the O.I. is a note that: "This interpretation encompasses the new affidavit on pages A-18 and A-19 and replaces the affidavit shown on page A-20."

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this revision of O.I. 4. [The motion was seconded.]

Ralph Romano (University of Minnesota, Duluth): As I read this, it means any foreign student who attended either high school or a collegiate institution and received any type of educational expense is ineligible. There is no stipulation as to where the expense comes from. He could get a PTA grant. He could get a disadvantaged student award of any type and it would make him ineligible. The difference would be it said in the old affidavit that the expense came from a hockey team. This designates educational expense without any source.

President Cross: This proposal prohibits ice hockey teams from providing educational expenses to players.

[Proposal No. 27 (page A-14) was approved by voice vote.]

Mr. Samborski: Mr. Chairman, Proposal No. 28 (page A-14) proposes the deletion of O.I. 5. The reason is that the A-B-C agreements specified are no longer in use.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this proposal.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

President Cross: In Proposal No. 29 there is an editorial change. "Canadian Amateur Hockey Association's Tier I classification" should

be changed to "Major Junior A Hockey." We are assured that the classification itself is not changed, they have merely changed the name, and this proposal should include the appropriate new name for that classification.

Mr. Samborski: Therefore, that proposal should read as follows: "Any student-athlete who has participated as a member of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association's Major Junior A Hockey Classification shall not be eligible for intercollegiate athletics."

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 29 (page A-14). [The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

Membership

Wilford H. Ketz (Union College, N.Y.): Proposal No. 30 adds a new O.I. 16, following Article 4, Section 2-(d) of the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this amendment. [The motion was seconded.]

This is a housekeeping amendment. Paragraph (d) stipulates that one of the conditions of membership is that an institution must sponsor four intercollegiate sports. This merely specifies at the time of application that the applicant must be conforming to that requirement.

[Proposal No. 30 (page A-15) was approved by voice vote.]

Site of High School Competition

William J. Flynn (Boston College): **Mr. President,** I move to add O.I. 105 as indicated in Proposal No. 32. [The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this interpretation is to keep coaches away from high school athletes during competition. Paragraph (a) is extremely important, namely that no contact shall be made with such prospect before competition during the day of the competition.

Once the high school student reports to his high school coach, you cannot contact him until the high school coach dismisses him.

[Proposal No. 32 (pages A-15 and A-16) was approved by voice vote.]

Football Playing Season

Mr. Flynn: **Mr. Chairman,** I move we add O.I. 202 as indicated in Proposal No. 33. [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, the purpose of this interpretation is to avoid two or more teams becoming involved in playoffs after the season or in a bowl game of their own. Schools may fill open dates, but they may not fill dates after their regular season. If two teams arrived at the end of their seasons, both undefeated and didn't have eleven games they could schedule each other and have for all intents and purposes a bowl game.

Frank Leftwich (Tuskegee Institute): I was led to believe in the district meeting that this amendment was presented by the Extra Events Committee. The reason Notre Dame went into bowl play was primarily financial.

Some of us find that at the end of the season there are not enough bowl games around to satisfy everybody. As long as schools are within their limit of games, I don't see where this possible extra game would interfere too much. Anybody being considered for a bowl game is being contacted. I am sure they would give that consideration.

Mr. Flynn: The game could not be televised and would have to come

within the television plan. Of course, we must remember, too, that the football season is defined as the second Saturday in September to the second Saturday in December.

[Proposal No. 33 (page A-16) was approved by voice vote.]

Transfer Rule

James Hansen (State University of New York, Buffalo): I propose the adoption of Proposal No. 34. [The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of the amendment is to enable students who transfer to this country from the junior colleges of Ontario, Canada, to be eligible for athletics. When they transfer to colleges in this country they are not eligible for athletics. This is an injustice to the students and we recommend the adoption of this amendment.

Cecil Coleman (Fresno State College): As a point of information, could the chair clarify, please, does this proposal have anything to do with the one that has already passed limiting a student-athlete's competition after his nineteenth birthday?

President Cross: I don't see how it would. The competition in this instance would be post-high school level.

Robley Williams (University of California, Berkeley): I have been asked by the Council to oppose this proposed amendment.

This amendment makes an exception for one specific area, the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in the Province of Ontario. If the general case is made that this should be applied to all junior colleges wherever they can be identified abroad, that would be another story, but to pick out a specific group and put in the Bylaws seems to be unwise.

[Proposal No. 34 (page A-16) was defeated by voice vote.]

1.600 Rule

Earl M. Ramer (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): **Mr. President,** I move the incorporation of new Official Interpretation 416, as indicated in Proposal No. 35. [The motion was seconded.]

Gentlemen, the only institution in our membership to which this applies, so far as I know, is Gallaudet College in Washington, D. C. All of its students have severe hearing impairment and oftentimes accompanying speech difficulties. The conventional tests we have been using for the calculation of tables are not valid for these handicapped students. It seems to be a clear-cut case of need for making a dispensation.

[Proposal No. 35 (page A-17) was approved by voice vote.]

10. OTHER PROPOSALS

1.600 Resolution

Wiles Hallock (Western Athletic Conference): **Mr. President,** this resolution is designed to hold in abeyance an interpretation made in October 1970, by the NCAA Council affecting alien student-athletes.

Prior to that time, an alien student-athlete was not required to qualify under the 1.600 legislation in the same manner as the United States student-athlete. Basically, he was not required to take a SAT or an ACT examination.

The Western Athletic Conference, while it is concerned with a need to provide some system of qualification under 1.600 legislation for the

alien student-athlete, feels that the interpretation adopted by the Council will drastically deter and discourage recruitment of foreign student-athletes.

We base this premise on the fact that if you require an alien student-athlete to take the SAT or the ACT, you are in fact making him qualify under experience tables which were certainly not developed for any but United States students.

The SAT and the ACT examinations were not intended to measure the scholastic competency of the alien student-athlete and these tests are not either culturally oriented or designed from the time factor to accommodate an alien student-athlete who has a language difficulty.

We propose instead in this resolution to require an alien student-athlete to establish a minimum of 2.00 high school grade point average or its equivalent; further, that this resolution be adopted for a period of one year.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this resolution. [The motion was seconded.]

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): If a test score is obtainable, would that apply to calculating the prediction, or could this proposed 2.00 grade point average be substituted for a test score?

Mr. Hallock: It is my understanding, under the present interpretation, that a test score is required. Under the intention of this resolution, no test score would be required. Obviously, if a test score were obtained and the alien student-athlete qualified under the table governing that institution, he would be eligible in any event, but the purpose of this resolution is to not require a test score if the alien student-athlete had a 2.00 high school grade point average.

Mr. Schultze: In other words, you are providing the institution with an option that it can do one or the other to determine his eligibility?

Mr. Hallock: Yes.

Mr. Schultze: Mr. Chairman, I urge the Convention to vote against this resolution because an institution should not be in a position to choose the most advantageous situation when it comes to importing an alien athlete, and we know a lot of them are imported.

My second question, Mr. Chairman, for Mr. Hallock deals with the statement that it shall be effective for one year from this date. In other words, you mean that this should apply only until January 13, 1972?

President Cross: That is what it says. I take it in the meantime some other accommodation, if it is desirable, could be worked out. Is that right, Mr. Hallock?

Mr. Hallock: That is right.

William Exum (Kentucky State College): We have heard previous arguments against the 1.600 legislation that were based on cultural deprivation. It seems to me that if this argument is going to be advanced in favor of foreign students and it is based on cultural deprivation, our American students ought to be considered in such a light.

The second reason I wish the resolution to be defeated is that there is a great deal of difficulty in getting foreign grades of any kind. The foreign high school definition in many of the European countries especially is entirely different than the United States definition.

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): The Academic Testing and Re-

quirements Committee and the Council agree entirely with the previous speaker. This would be special legislation for one group while not paying attention to the critical problems of our own citizens.

The second point is that what the Western Athletic Conference has advised here is an open-door for all foreign student-athletes. Actually, the foreign student-athlete who can read fluently no doubt can pass the SAT.

[Proposal No. 47 (pages A-24 and A-25) was defeated by voice vote.]

Drug Resolution

President Cross: Proposal No. 48 (page A-25) reflects the action taken by the Council preceding the Convention. [The motion was regularly made and seconded that the resolution be approved.]

[Proposal No. 48 was approved by voice vote.]

Revisions of Executive Regulations

President Cross: Executive Regulations become operative upon adoption by the Executive Committee and do not need affirmative approval by the Convention. I will ask the members of the Executive Committee to state the legislation, explain it and answer such questions as there may be. If there is a motion to disapprove it will be received, but otherwise we will move to the next proposal.

Wayne Duke (Big Eight Conference): Proposal No. 36 (page A-21) states "A meet or tournament committee or games committee may not require membership in any specific officials association as a prerequisite for selection to officiate in an NCAA meet or tournament."

This proposal removes any restriction on the ability of a meet or tournament committee to obtain competent officials.

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. President, members of our Association serve as hosts for many NCAA regional and national tournaments. Proposal No. 37 (page A-21) provides that the Association will pay for all awards and it will assume up to \$500 for deficits, exclusive of the cost of meetings, hospitality and other social activities.

Currently there is no allowance provided in any of our regulations to take up these deficits. A study indicated \$500 will take care of almost all deficits of such tournaments if the cost of meetings, hospitality banquets or social activities are excluded in the budget.

President Cross: It was Executive Committee's thinking in regard to this proposal that as our exchequer became more affluent it seemed to be only reasonable to use this method to return some of the excess to member institutions who carry this important part of the program.

Stan Bates (Washington State University): Mr. President, Proposal No. 38 provides for the distribution of net receipts for volleyball to be handled in the same way as they are handled for College and University baseball, College and University basketball, ice hockey and soccer.

Francis E. Smiley (Colorado School of Mines): Item No. 39 (page A-22) is designed to do for water polo the same thing Mr. Bates explained to you in connection with volleyball.

Marcus L. Plant (University of Michigan): Proposal No. 40 (page A-22) is designed to permit the scheduling National Collegiate and National College Division Baseball Championship games on Sunday. If a participating institution has a policy against Sunday competition,

the Tournament Committee is required to adjust the schedule to accommodate that institution.

Proposal No. 41 (pages A-22 and A-23) deletes the sentence in italics, since it is now unnecessary. It appears in our contract with the Spencer Marketing Services.

Wayne Duke (Big Eight Conference): The purpose of Proposal No. 42 (page A-23) is two-fold. It brings into one regulation the advertising policies for game programs, broadcasts and telecasts of national championship events. It also accepts the sponsorship of these events by malt beverages.

Delegate: The promotion of any sort of malt beverages is not compatible with intercollegiate athletics. As I recall, last year this body voted against this proposal.

Mr. Duke: The history of this particular advertising specification is this: It was permitted on our national collegiate football television series. The Executive Committee a year ago authorized such sponsorship in connection with the National Basketball Championship telecast. At the present time, most of the major athletic conferences and indeed a number of individual or independent institutions permit such sponsorship not only in their basketball television series, but certain of their game programs and radio broadcasts.

President Cross: Malt beverage advertising may be used without restriction in game programs of championship events consistent with the policy of the host institution. The host institution does not have to accept this type of advertising.

Delegate: Mr. Chairman, I move to reject this particular recommendation.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and defeated.]

Mr. Duke: Items 43, 44 and 45 (pages A-23 and A-24), if I may take them together, all pertain to proposals to raise the per diem allowable for committee expenses from \$25 per day to \$30 per day. All other regulations pertaining to individual travel expenses of the rules committees, the Executive Committee and the Council remain the same.

Recommended Policies

Dwight T. Reed (Lincoln University): Mr. President, I move the adoption of the Recommended Policy in Item No. 46.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

Constitution and Bylaws Resolution

Anthony Morella (American University): Mr. President, I move the following resolution:

"Whereas, the Council of this Association has adopted in behalf of the membership recodified, reorganized and revised Constitution and Bylaws to become effective August 1, 1971, as amended by the 1971 Convention of the Association, and

"Whereas, several substantive changes have been made by the Council as noted and in the fashion presented, and

"Whereas, some revisions of substance have not been specified with particularity in the fashion of amendment and presented,

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that further circularization with particularity on added substantive amendments to the Constitution and By-laws revisions, as passed by the Council and not directly con-

sidered by the membership at the 1971 meeting, be accomplished not later than August 1, 1971."

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

Transfer Rule

Robert M. Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Conference): Will we actually vote on the Revised Constitution and Bylaws later?

President Cross: No.

Mr. Whitelaw: New O.I. 400-(b)-(7) reads as follows: "He shall not be considered a transfer upon return from at least 18 months of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States."

Mr. President, I move that this provision be made effective immediately.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

11. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Robert C. James (Mid-American Conference): Mr. President, I am pleased to inform you and the delegates that the assigned members of your Committee on Committees gave full consideration to all nominees for the vacancies on committees for which it is responsible. With the talent available for appointment it is always most difficult to select those best qualified to serve.

Our nominations, which have been distributed to the delegates, represent those members we endorse for appointment to designated committees and for the terms specified.

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the nominations.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

[The committees for 1971-72 may be found on pages 87-98 of the 1971-72 NCAA Manual.]

12. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

President Cross: Before receiving the Report of the Nominating Committee, I want to express my very great appreciation of the opportunity to serve in this position and my thanks not only to the Council and the Executive Committee, but the staff and all the members of the committees and the individual members of the institutions which comprise our membership for an interesting, reasonably busy, rewarding and certainly a wonderful experience.

[The assembly rose and applauded.]

H. Boyd McWhorter (University of Georgia): Gentlemen, the unanimous recommendation of this Committee to fill the positions of president and secretary, those district vice-presidents whose terms expire, and the at-large members of the same category is as follows:

For President of our Association—

Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee

For Secretary-Treasurer—

Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University

For District 2 Vice-President—

Ernest C. Casale, Temple University

For District 4 Vice-President—

John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University

For District 6 Vice-President—

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

For District 8 Vice-President—

George F. Ilg, Fresno State College

For three at-large members of the Council—

Howard C. Gentry, Tennessee State University

Harry M. Cross, University of Washington

J. William Davis, Texas Tech University

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Nominating Committee, I move the acceptance of these nominations.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

[The officers of the Association and members of the Council may be found on pages 5-7.]

President Cross: I take pleasure in turning this gavel over to you, Earl.

[Mr. Earl M. Ramer assumed the chair.]

President-elect Ramer: Members of the Association, one of the greatest satisfactions of my life has been working with this group over a period of years. I consider the position an important one, as you do. I value your confidence and look forward very much to our continuing working together.

I have a feeling—and I hope it is not an unfounded one—that the kind of contribution we have made during the past few years and will continue to make will strengthen immeasurably the framework of our college and university system in this country, for it is under attack as never before. [Applause]

Secretary-elect Barnes: Mr. President and Gentlemen: This is really something. I cannot tell you how much I appreciate it. It has been a pleasure working with the Council members. It has been a pleasure working with the NCAA, first of all, because I believe, as of course you do, that you are sincere in all that you say and all that you do. Therefore, it is a pleasure to serve you in whatever capacity I can, any time that I can, and I sincerely tell you that I will give it everything I have. [Applause]

President-elect Ramer: Your standing vote of applause literally reflected your great satisfaction and pleasure with the work of Harry Cross and Bill Flynn. They have done a magnificent job in advancing the work of the Association.

I want to present to them at this time a token of that pleasure and satisfaction, a very nice pen set. Harry and Bill, we hope you continue through the years to write words of wisdom. [Presenting gifts.]

We must also express great appreciation to Walter Byers and his colleagues in the national office for assisting us in the future as well as in the past to carry on the most businesslike operation of that office. I know that you join me in an expression of appreciation to them. [Applause]

Are there other matters that need to come before this Convention? If not, I declare the Sixty-Fifth Convention adjourned.

[The convention adjourned at 1:25 p.m.]

Appendix A

65th ANNUAL CONVENTION

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

[NOTE: In the following proposed amendments, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All amendments shall be effective August 1, 1971, unless otherwise indicated. All page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1971-72 Revised Constitution and Bylaws.]

AWARDS

No. 1. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(7)-(ii), page 13, as follows:

"(ii) Awards for special events such as postseason football games, NCAA meets and tournaments and featured individual competition *may include medals, trophies, plaques, scrolls, luggage, binoculars, blazers, watches, rings or jewelry of a similar nature and other items identified by geographical region which are approved by the Extra Events Committee must be properly personalized. Also, a memento commemorative of the event or identified by geographical region may be presented as a second item providing that it does not exceed a maximum cost of \$20 and it is approved by the Extra Events Committee. Multiple awards are permissible for special events, but the value of any and all awards received by any one competitor may not exceed \$100.*"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit unclassified awards for special events provided they are personalized and the cost does not exceed \$100.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

PRINCIPLES GOVERNING FINANCIAL AID

No. 2. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(a), by adding a new paragraph (3), page 17, as follows:

"(3) **Recipients of the Tony Lema Memorial Scholarship Award may be permitted to participate in intercollegiate golf upon written application to the Council by the institution.**"

Source: Bucknell University.

Intent: To permit Tony Lema Memorial Award winners to participate in intercollegiate golf.

Action: Defeated 166-125 (needed two-thirds majority).

SUMMER BASKETBALL

No. 3. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(c), page 23, as follows:

"(c) He must not participate in any organized, outside basketball competition except during the permissible playing season specified in Bylaw 3, or during the period from June 15 to August

31, provided he obtains written permission from his institution's director of athletics (or the latter's official representative), and he competes on a team in a league approved by the NCAA.

"(1) For a league to be approved, it must conform to the following requirements: (i) no member team shall include on its roster more than one player with intercollegiate eligibility remaining in the sport of basketball from any one college, university or junior college; (ii) no member team shall have on its staff any person associated in any capacity with a college, university or junior college; (iii) no member team shall make any payments for play or expenses directly or indirectly to any player; (iv) all players must limit their competition to one team in one league; (v) no admission shall be charged for any game; (vi) no all-star games of any kind shall be permitted, and (vii) no postseason playoffs or tournaments shall be permitted.

"(2) Such Participation in violation of this provision shall require the member institution to rule the student-athlete ineligible for intercollegiate competition in the sport of basketball. Participation by residents of Puerto Rico in the Superior Basketball League of Puerto Rico is exempted from this ruling. A student-athlete may compete in one game a year involving players from his former high school and its alumni team. The Council shall have authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American or Olympic tryouts and competition, or participate in other international competition approved by the Department of State of the U. S. Government and sanctioned by the Council of the Association. Request for Council sanction must be made by the institution at least 30 days prior to that competition."

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference and MacMurray College.

Intent: To permit summer basketball competition by student-athletes on teams in leagues approved by the NCAA.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

SOCCKER

No. 4. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(d), page 23, as follows:

"(d) He shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate soccer competition if, following his enrollment in college and during any year in which he is a member of the intercollegiate soccer squad or team, he competes as a member of any outside soccer team during the intercollegiate soccer season, or if he competes on any occasion as a member of an outside soccer team which is not approved by the Council of this Association. The Council shall have authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American or Olympic tryouts and competition. A freshman cannot compete in outside competition in the sport of soccer during the intercollegiate season if his institution has a freshman soccer team, or if freshmen are eligible for the varsity. The intercollegiate soccer season shall be the period of time between the opening of the institution's formal freshman or varsity practice and

the last regularly scheduled soccer game as well as any postseason intercollegiate soccer competition."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to compete in Pan American and Olympic soccer tryouts and competition without jeopardizing his intercollegiate eligibility.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

INTERPRETATIONS

No. 5. Constitution: Amend Article 6 by inserting the word, "Interpretations," in the heading after "Bylaws" and adding a new Section 2 (renumbering subsequent sections), page 37, as follows:

"Section 2. Interpretations. The Council, in the interim between Conventions and the president, secretary-treasurer and executive director, in the interim between meetings of the Council, are empowered to make interpretations of the Constitution and Bylaws which shall be binding after their publication and circulation to the membership. Any member of the Association may request that any such interpretation be passed upon by the next annual Convention by making such request in accordance with the same procedures required for the submission of an amendment of the Constitution or Bylaws to an annual Convention.

"(a) If a Constitutional Interpretation submitted to the Convention fails to receive a two-thirds majority of those delegates present and voting it shall not thereafter be binding upon the membership.

"(b) If an interpretation of the Bylaws submitted to the Convention fails to receive a majority of those delegates present and voting it shall not thereafter be binding upon the membership.

"(c) All interpretations approved by the Convention shall be incorporated into the Constitution or Bylaws as Official Interpretations. Other interpretations issued by the Council or the officers also may be included in the Official Interpretations if so designated by the Council."

Source: NCAA Council (Collegiate Commissioners Association).

Intent: To formalize procedures for issuing and reviewing Official Interpretations of the Constitution and Bylaws.

Action: Approved, as amended, by voice vote.

A. Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 5, first paragraph, as follows:

"Section 2. Interpretations. The Council, in the interim between Conventions and the president, secretary-treasurer and the executive director, in the interim between meetings of the Council, are empowered to make interpretations of the Constitution and Bylaws which shall be binding after their publication and circulation to the membership. Any member of the Association may request that any such interpretation be passed upon by the next annual Convention by making such request in accordance with the same procedures required for the submission of an amendment of the Constitution or Bylaws to an annual Convention writing to the

secretary prior to one o'clock in the afternoon on the day preceding the final business session of the Convention.

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To place the same limitations on submission of interpretations to the annual Convention as those for amendments to amendments.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

TRANSPORTATION, VISITATIONS AND ENTERTAINMENT

No. 6. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5, by adding a new paragraph (f) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, page 49, as follows:

"(f) If an institution is required to play all of its home games of a given sport at a site located in a community other than its own because of conditions beyond its control (e.g. fire, windstorm, earthquake or other disaster) the institution may apply to the Council or the officers of the Association for permission to consider the substitute site as its home site. Upon approval by the Council or the officers, such games on the substitute site shall be considered on-campus competition."

Source: NCAA Council (Washington State University).

Intent: To enable an institution to have a substitute game site designated an on-campus site for purposes of recruiting when its on-campus facility cannot be used due to conditions beyond its control.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

POSTSEASON FOOTBALL CONTESTS

No. 7. Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2-(b), page 57, as follows:

"Section 2. Postseason Football Contests. No member institution shall compete in any football game that is not scheduled as to the identity of a participating collegiate team before the beginning of the regular football season of the college for any academic year, unless the given contest complies with the following requirements or meets the following conditions:

"(b) The competing institutions shall be active members of this Association and must be conducting their intercollegiate athletic programs in conformance with Bylaw 4-6-(b)."

Source: NCAA Council (Collegiate Commissioners Association).

Intent: To require member institutions to operate their athletic programs in conformance with Bylaw 4-6-(b) in order to be eligible for postseason football competition.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

COLLEGE ALL-STAR FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL CONTESTS

No. 8. Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 3-(a), page 59, as follows:

"(a) Participation shall be limited to college seniors who are academically eligible, except that other undergraduate students shall be eligible to participate in the National Association of Basketball Coaches annual all-star game."

Source: MacMurray College.

Intent: To permit underclassmen to participate in the NABC East-West game.

Action: Failed of motion.

BASKETBALL PLAYING SEASON

No. 9. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(b), page 65, as follows:

"(b) Preseason practice in basketball shall not begin prior to October 15 of each year; the first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition shall not be played prior to December 1 [except as provided in paragraph (d) below]; the last contest game or scrimmage shall not be played after the National Collegiate Basketball Championship; except that, informal practice scrimmages with outside competition may be permitted prior to December 1 provided they are conducted in privacy without publicity or official scoring and, provided further, that such scrimmages shall be counted against the permissible number of contests. The maximum number of contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition during such period shall not exceed twenty-six exclusive of contests in one postseason tournament, which may be conducted with outside competition during such period shall not exceed twenty-eight, and no more than twenty-six of this number may be scheduled games. No postseason tournament contest shall be played after the National Collegiate Basketball Championship. In the event November 30 falls on a Friday or Saturday, the first contest (game or scrimmage) of that year may be played on that date."

Source: MacMurray College and Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit two outside scrimmages in addition to a 26-game schedule.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

FRESHMAN RULE

No. 10. Bylaws: Amend Article 4 as follows:

1. Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 71, as follows:

"(d) For the purposes of eligibility in football and basketball, he must have completed a full freshman year of two full semesters or three full quarters or one academic year as defined by the certifying institution; or He must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution, except that this provision shall not apply if he predicted a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national experience tables at the time of his graduation from high school and meets one or more of the following requirements: (i) he is a graduate of a junior college; or (ii) he presents a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college; or (iii) he presents a minimum of twenty-four semester hours, or a minimum of thirty-six quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.500."

2. Amend Article 4, Section 1-(f)-(3), page 73, as follows:

"(3) Freshmen are not eligible for varsity competition in football and basketball; they are eligible for varsity competition in all other sports. Participation by a freshman on the varsity football or basketball team of a junior college, or of an institution with an undergraduate male enrollment of less than 1250 at the beginning of the academic year shall not be counted as one of the three four permissible seasons of varsity competition. (Freshmen are not eligible for NCAA-sponsored events in football and basketball unless they qualify under Section 2 of this Article.)

3. Amend Article 4, by deleting Section 2, page 79.

Source: Hofstra University and C. W. Post College.

Intent: To make freshmen eligible for competition in all NCAA events.

Action: Defeated by vote of 102-113.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 11. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d)-(1), pages 71 and 73, as follows:

"(1) A student who transfers from a junior college after attendance at any four-year college must complete one calendar year of residence at the certifying institution, unless he has completed a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six quarter hours at the junior college following his transfer from the four-year college, and also has graduated from the junior college, or is readmitted to the four-year college first attended."

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To eliminate the exception to the junior college transfer rule for the student-athlete returning to the four-year college he first attended.

Action: Withdrawn.

ALIEN STUDENT-ATHLETES

No. 12. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(f)-(2), page 73, as follows:

"(2) Participation as an individual or as a representative of any team whatever in a foreign country by an alien student-athlete in each twelve-month period after his twentieth nineteenth birthday and prior to his matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition."

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Special Committee on Ice Hockey).

Intent: To lower the age under which alien student-athletes may compete in their own country without loss of collegiate eligibility.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

FRESHMAN RULE

No. 13. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 2, page 79, as follows:

"Section 2. College Division Exceptions. The following exceptions to Section 1 are granted in connection with NCAA-sponsored College Division events:

"(a) Freshmen enrolled at an institution which has an undergraduate male enrollment of less than 1250 at the beginning of the academic year may compete in all College Division football and basketball events provided they are otherwise eligible. They also shall be eligible for three additional seasons of varsity competition in these sports.

"(b) Freshmen who compete on the varsity football and basketball teams of College Division institutions which have an undergraduate male enrollment of 1250 or more at the beginning of the academic year are ineligible for College Division football and basketball events as freshmen; however, they are eligible for three additional seasons of competition in such College Division events."

Source: California State College at Hayward and Muskingum College (NCAA College Committee, NCAA College Basketball Committee, NCAA College Football Committee).

Intent: To make freshmen eligible for College Division events in all sports.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1971.

WAIVERS

No. 14. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 3, by adding paragraph (d), page 81, as follows:

"(d) The Council may, by a two-thirds vote of its members, approve exceptions to Sections 1 and 2 for institutions which have suffered extraordinary personnel losses from one or more of their intercollegiate athletic teams due to accident or illness of a disastrous nature."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To enable an institution which has had its squad decimated by accident or illness to appeal for a waiver of portions of Bylaw 4-1 and 4-2 in order to complete its regular playing season without penalty to freshmen who thereby compete on the varsity team or to those students involved in the disaster who have eligibility remaining.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY FOR NCAA EVENTS

No. 15. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6, page 81, as follows:

"Section 6. Institutional Eligibility. The NCAA sponsors twenty-six national championship events, of which seventeen are National Collegiate Championship events and nine are National College Division Championship events. (The listing of these events is contained in Bylaw 5-1, page 87.) To be eligible to enter a team or individual in NCAA championship competition, an institution must be an active member in good standing and be eligible under the rules of the intercollegiate athletic conference of which it is a member, provided the conference is an allied member of the Association."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify that the NCAA recognizes penalties imposed by allied

conferences which are designed to prohibit institutions from entering NCAA competition.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

1.600 RULE

No. 16. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, by deleting Sections 6-(b) and 6-(c), and all applicable interpretations, pages 81-87.

Source: Bridgewater State College, Brooklyn College, City College of New York, Clark University, Clarkson College of Technology, Colby College, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Delaware Valley College, Georgetown University, Haverford College, Hobart College, Hofstra University, Hunter College, Kutztown State College, University of Maine at Farmington, Nichols College of Business Administration, Northeastern University, New York University, Pace College, Queens College, State University of New York at Albany, State University of New York at Binghamton, State University of New York at Buffalo, State University College at Geneseo, State University College at New Paltz, State University College at Oneonta, State University College at Oswego, State University College at Plattsburgh, State University College at Potsdam, Union College (N.Y.) and Western New England College.

Intent: To abolish the 1.600 legislation.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

1.600 RULE

No. 17. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b), pages 81-83, as follows:

"(b) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet, unless the institution in the conduct of all its intercollegiate athletic programs:

"(1) Limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree), and eligibility for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions during the first year in residence to student-athletes who have a predicted minimum grade point average of at least 1.600 (based on a maximum of 4.000) as determined by the Association's national experience tables or Association-approved conference or institutional tables, except that an institution may provide financial aid to a student whose matriculation was not solicited by a member of the athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests (see O.I. 100) and whose admission and financial aid have been granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability; such a student shall not be eligible for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions unless he satisfies the requirements of paragraph 2-(ii) and there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty athletic representative, the admissions officer and chairman of the financial aid committee that this exception applies; and

"(2) Limits its subsequent scholarship and grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered

in any degree) and eligibility for competition in varsity intercollegiate athletics to student-athletes who have a grade point average, either accumulative or for the previous academic year, of at least 1.600; except that

"(1) The performance requirement of this paragraph (2) shall not apply to institutions that use a student-athlete who predicted at least 1.600 upon entrance into an institution which uses the Association's national experience tables or more demanding institutional or conference predictive formulae in applying paragraph (1). Such institutions as to such a student-athlete, he shall be limited only by the official institutional regulations governing normal progress toward a degree for all students, as well as any other applicable institutional eligibility rules, including those of the athletic conference of which the institution is a member. These institutional or conference standards shall be filed in the office of the Association.

"(ii) As to the exception referred to in paragraph (1), the institution may continue financial aid, but shall withhold eligibility for participation in athletics or organized athletic practice sessions until the student has completed a full academic year and earned a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or thirty-six quarter hours of degree credit work with a minimum accumulated average of 1.600.

"(iii) A student-athlete (see O.I. 100) who did not predict at least 1.600 at the member institution upon his entrance and was the recipient of financial aid of any kind from the institution, either directly or indirectly, in the form of a scholarship, grant-in-aid, job or loan, may not become eligible for participation in athletics or organized athletic practice sessions until he has completed two full academic years and earned a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of degree credit work with a minimum accumulated grade point average of 1.600; further, he may not subsequently be awarded a scholarship or grant-in-aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability was considered in any degree).

"(iv) A student-athlete (see O.I. 100) who did not predict at least 1.600 at the member institution upon his entrance, and was not the recipient of financial aid of any kind from the institution, either directly or indirectly, in the form of a scholarship, grant-in-aid, job or loan, may not become eligible for participation in athletics or organized athletic practice sessions until he has completed a full academic year and earned a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or thirty-six quarter hours of degree credit work with a minimum accumulated grade point average of 1.600; further, he may not subsequently be awarded a scholarship or grant-in-aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability was considered in any degree).

"(v) A student who did not predict at least 1.600 at the

member institution upon his entrance, and has not received financial aid of any kind from the institution, either directly or indirectly, may after completion of a full academic year and the acquisition of a minimum of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of degree credit work with a minimum accumulated grade point average of 1.600 become a student-athlete eligible for a scholarship or grant-in-aid for which the recipient's athletic ability was considered."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To modify the financial aid provisions of the 1.600 rule for bona fide disadvantaged student programs and to clarify and strengthen the rule's application to all athletically recruited students.

Action: Approved, as amended, by voice vote, effective immediately.

C. Bylaws. Amend proposal No. 17 by deleting paragraphs (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v).

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

1.600 RULE

No. 18. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b)-(1), page 81, as follows:

"(b) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet, unless the institution in the conduct of all its intercollegiate athletic programs:

"(1) Limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree), and eligibility for participation in athletics or in organized practice sessions during the first year in residence to student-athletes who have a predicted minimum grade point average of at least 1.600 (based on a maximum of 4.000) as determined by the Association's national experience tables or Association-approved conference or institutional tables; except that an institution may permit a student who did not predict 1.600 upon enrollment and who attained that average or higher after one semester or two quarters to participate in athletics or organized athletic practice sessions on the opening day of classes of the succeeding semester or quarter; and . . ."

Source: Boston University.

Intent: To permit sub-predictors to practice and participate (but not receive financial aid) if they attain a minimum 1.600 average after one semester or two quarters.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

TRANSFER OF MEMBERSHIP

No. 19. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 4-(c), page 93, as follows:

"(c) From District 3 to District 2

American University, Washington, D. C.

George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia
Howard University, Washington, D. C.
Maryland State College, Princess Anne
Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland
U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland"

Source: George Washington University.

Intent: To transfer its membership from District 3 to District 2, effective immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

TRANSFER OF MEMBERSHIP

No. 20. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 4-(f), page 93, as follows:

"(f) From District 4 to District 5

Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois

Cincinnati, University of, Cincinnati, Ohio"

Source: University of Cincinnati.

Intent: To return its membership to District 4, effective immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

TRANSFER OF MEMBERSHIP

No. 21. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 4-(f), page 93, as follows:

"From District 4 to District 5

Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois

Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota"

Source: Mankato State College.

Intent: To transfer its membership from District 4 to District 5, effective immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

PROMOTION COMMITTEE

No. 22. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 2, as follows:

1. Amend Article 7, Section 2-(a)-(2), page 99, as follows:

"(2) Members may be reappointed for one additional term and after three years have elapsed, a former member may be appointed to an additional term following which he may not serve further on that committee. This paragraph shall not apply to the members of the Executive Committee, Promotion Committee and the Committee on Infractions."

2. Amend Article 7, Section 2, by adding a new paragraph (w), page 105, as follows:

"(w) The Promotion Committee shall develop and administer promotional activities for the benefit of the membership generally as well as the Association and its championship events. The Committee shall be:

"(1) Active in soliciting recommendations for general and specific projects from other committees of the Association and the membership generally;

"(2) Responsible to the Executive Committee for financial matters and to the Council for matters of policy; and

"(3) Composed of the chairman of the Public Relations Committee; the chairman of the Conference Information Directors; a representative of the Collegiate Commissioners Association; a representative of the Television Committee; a CoSIDA member from an independent institution, or an institution which is a member of a conference which is not a member of the CCA; the director of National Collegiate Sports Services, and the Association's director of public relations, one of whom shall serve as chairman."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To formalize the Association's promotional activities.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

RULES COMMITTEES

No. 23. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 3-(a)-(1), pages 105-107, as follows:

"(1) It shall be the duty of the above committees to establish and maintain rules of play in their respective sports consistent with sound traditions of these sports and of such character as to ensure good sportsmanship and safe participation by the competitors. It shall also be the duty of the committees in sports for which national records are maintained to approve such records. Any rule of play may be reviewed by the Executive Committee. If the Executive Committee, after consultation with the rules committee involved, determines that the rule is not appropriate for financial or other administrative reasons, the Executive Committee may recommend to the Council that such rule be revoked or suspended. The Council, after receiving the opinions of the rules committee and the Executive Committee, may revoke such rule, suspend the rule and request reconsideration by the rules committee, deny the Executive Committee reconsideration or take other appropriate action. The Council may authorize any rules committee to cooperate with other national organizations in the development of common playing rules."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide that actions of rules committees may be subject to Council (and Convention) review, similar to all other committees of the Association, limiting review to those committee decisions which have substantial financial or other administrative repercussions.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

RULES COMMITTEES

No. 24. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 3-(a), by adding a new paragraph (12), page 105, as follows:

"(12) In order for a district to be represented on a rules and meet

or tournament committee, at least five of its active members must sponsor the sport on an intercollegiate basis."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require a minimum number of a district's membership to sponsor intercollegiate activity in a sport to be eligible for representation on a rules committee.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

SWIMMING RULES AND MEET COMMITTEE

No. 25. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 3-(f), page 109, as follows:

"(f) The Swimming Rules and Meet Committee shall consist of thirteen fifteen members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) One member from each of the eight geographic districts;

"(2) Three Four members-at-large, one of whom shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four, one from a College Division member located in Districts Five through Eight, and the third one shall be elected secretary-rules editor, and the fourth shall have expertise in diving;

"(3) Two who shall represent secondary school swimming interests, and

"(4) One who shall represent junior college swimming interests."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To add two members to the Committee; one with expertise in diving and one who shall represent junior college swimming interests.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective immediately.

WRESTLING RULES AND TOURNAMENT COMMITTEE

No. 26. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 3-(g), page 109 as follows:

"(g) The Wrestling Rules and Tournament Committee shall consist of sixteen fifteen members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) One member from each of the eight geographic districts, except District Six;

"(2) Three members-at-large, one of whom shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four, one from a College Division member located in Districts Five through Eight and the third elected secretary-rules editor;

"(3) One member who shall represent junior college wrestling interests, and

"(4) Four members who shall represent secondary school wrestling interests."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To reduce the number of members from sixteen to fifteen.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective immediately.

65th ANNUAL CONVENTION

REVIEW OF INTERPRETATIONS

[NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, the following interpretations were approved by the Council during 1970. Those letters and words which are to be deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which are to be added appear in **bold face**. All page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1971-72 Revised Constitution and Bylaws.]

ICE HOCKEY ELIGIBILITY

No. 27. Constitution: Revise O.I. 4, page 7, as follows:

"A student-athlete may have played ice hockey on a team in the *Canadian Amateur Hockey Association* a foreign country prior to his matriculation at a member institution, provided that any student-athlete who has been a member of a *any ice hockey team in the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association* a foreign country shall be ineligible if he has received, directly or indirectly, any salary, division or split of surplus, **educational expenses**, or has received payment for any expenses in excess of actual and necessary travel expenses on team trips, a reasonable allowance for one meal for each practice and home game and actual and necessary travel expenses to practice and home games. No student-athlete shall represent his institution in ice hockey unless there is on file in the office of the director of athletics an affidavit in form prescribed by this Association signed by the student-athlete stating his compliance with this provision. [NOTE: This interpretation encompasses the new affidavit on pages A-18 and A-19, replacing the affidavit shown on page A-20.]"

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Special Committee on Ice Hockey).

Action: Approved by voice vote.

ICE HOCKEY ELIGIBILITY

No. 28. Constitution: Delete O.I. 5, page 7.

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Special Committee on Ice Hockey).

Intent: To delete the interpretation since A-B-C agreements specified are no longer in use.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

ICE HOCKEY ELIGIBILITY

No. 29. Constitution: Add a new O.I. 5, page 7, as follows:

"Any student-athlete who has participated as a member of the *Canadian Amateur Hockey Association's* major junior A classification shall not be eligible for intercollegiate athletics."

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Special Committee on Ice Hockey); effective August 1, 1971.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

MEMBERSHIP

No. 30. Constitution: Add O.I. 16, following Article 4, Section 2-(d), page 25, as follows:

"To be eligible for active membership, an institution shall be in compliance with paragraph (d) at the time it makes application."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

STUDENT-ATHLETE

No. 31. Bylaws: Revise O.I. 100, page 43, as follows:

"A 'student-athlete' is a student whose matriculation was solicited by a member of the athletic department staff or by a other representative of its athletic interests with a view toward the student's ultimate participation in the varsity intercollegiate athletic program. Any other student becomes a 'student-athlete' only when he reports for a freshman or varsity squad which is under the jurisdiction of the department of intercollegiate athletics. A student is not deemed a 'student-athlete' solely because of his prior participation in high school athletics.

"(a) A prospective student becomes a prospective 'student-athlete' (i.e., matriculation is considered to have been solicited) if a member of the athletic staff or other representative of athletic interests: (1) provides transportation to the prospective student to visit its campus; (2) entertains the prospective student in any way on the campus except the institution may make available to the prospect a complimentary admission to an athletic contest; (3) initiates or arranges a telephone contact with the prospective student or member of his family (or guardian) for the purpose of recruitment; (4) visits or entertains a prospective student or members of his family (or guardian) for the purpose of recruitment, or (5) entertains members of the family (or guardian) of a prospective student on its campus.

"(b) Matriculation is considered not to have been solicited if a member of the athletic staff or other representative of athletic interests (1) comes in normal contact (without pre-arrangement) with a prospective student or members of his family (or guardian) and exhibits normal civility excluding any attempts to recruit the prospect or (2) requests via mail a prospective student or a member of his family (or guardian) to complete and return a questionnaire relative to his high school, preparatory school or junior college record."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

SITE OF HIGH SCHOOL COMPETITION

No. 32. Bylaws: Add O.I. 105, following Bylaw 1-1-(b), page 43, as follows:

"'Contact' with a prospect 'at the site of his high school's athletic competition' shall be governed by the following:

"(a) No contact shall be made with such prospect before the competition during the day of the competition.

"(b) If the prospect reports on call at the direction of his high school coach (or comparable authority) and is to be involved in team activity from that point to the end of the competition (e.g., travelling to an away-from-home game) and this occurs prior to the day of competition, then no contact shall be made from the time the prospect reports until after the competition.

"(c) After the competition has been completed, the 'site' shall be interpreted as the facility in which the competition was conducted and any dressing room or meeting facility utilized in conjunction with the competition. Accordingly, contact shall not be made after the competition at the site until the prospective student-athlete is released by his high school authority, he dresses and he departs the dressing and meeting facility.

"(d) If a prospective student-athlete is involved in competition which requires his participation more than one day (e.g., basketball tournament) paragraphs (a) and (b) apply and no contact shall be made during the periods between the prospect's competition until his final contest is completed, he is released by his high school authority, he dresses and he departs the dressing room or meeting room facility utilized in conjunction with his final participation in the competition."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

FOOTBALL PLAYING SEASON

No. 33. Bylaws: Add O.I. 202, following Bylaw 2-2-(n), page 59, as follows:

"An open date refers to a regular weekend playing date prior to the end of an institution's regular football schedule on which an institution is not playing a game."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 34. Bylaws: Revise O.I. 403, page 77, as follows:

"The term 'junior college' refers to American junior colleges and is not descriptive of, or applicable to, the educational institutions of other nations excepting as hereinafter noted. Students from foreign institutions of college or university level, except those entering as bona fide exchange students and students transferring from Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology with a minimum of 48 semester hours of 'B' average credit, must comply with the full transfer rule to be eligible. A bona fide foreign exchange student includes one who is sent by his government or is sponsored by the U. S. Department of State, Rotary International, the Ford Foundation, the Institute of International Education or similar organizations."

Source: State University of New York, Buffalo.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

1.600 RULE

No. 35. Bylaws: Add new O.I. 416, page 85, as follows:

"The Council, by a two-thirds vote, is authorized to grant exceptions to Bylaw 4-6-(b)-(1) for institutions whose total academic program is directed toward physically handicapped students."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

INTERCOLLEGIATE ICE HOCKEY AFFIDAVIT
For intercollegiate ice hockey eligibility per O.I. 4

Name _____

Home Address _____

College Address _____

I, _____, being first duly sworn, depose and say:

1. The date of my birth is: _____

2. The following is a complete report of my participation experienced in a foreign country as a representative of any team whatever, or as an individual, since my nineteenth birthday and prior to my matriculation at a college in the United States:

3. The following is a complete report of my ice hockey participation in any foreign country for two ice hockey seasons immediately preceding my matriculation to a college in the United States:

Season _____	Season _____
Team _____	Team _____
Team Classification _____	Team Classification _____
Address _____	Address _____
General Manager _____	General Manager _____
Coach _____	Coach _____

4. I received the following payments from the teams listed above:

Weekly Salary _____	Weekly Salary _____
Division or Split of Surplus _____	Division or Split of Surplus _____
Educational Expenses _____	Educational Expenses _____
Weekly Expense Allowance _____	Weekly Expense Allowance _____
Monthly Expense Allowance _____	Monthly Expense Allowance _____

5. In addition to the two seasons documented in No. 3 and No. 4 above, I also received the following payments prior to those seasons:

Signature

Institution

Subscribed and sworn before me

this _____ day of _____, 19____.

Notary Public

Notarial Seal

For the above signatory to be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletic competition, this affidavit must be signed by the general manager(s) or coach(es) listed in item No. 3 above and by his parent or guardian certifying to the authenticity of the information recorded; it must be on file with the appropriate athletic authority at his institution.

General Manager and Coach

Parent or Guardian

General Manager and Coach

Affidavit

For intercollegiate ice hockey eligibility per O.I. 4, page 7.

State of _____

County of _____

I, _____, being first duly sworn, depose and say:

1. The date of my birth is _____

2. The following is a complete report of my participation as a representative of any team whatever, or as an individual, experienced outside the United States, since my twentieth birthday and prior to my matriculation at a college in the United States:

3. I have never signed Tryout Agreement A or Option Agreement B or Option Agreement C as used by the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association and the National Hockey League.

4. I have never received any salary; division or split of surplus; educational expenses from any hockey club; or any other expenses in excess of actual and necessary expenses on team trips, a reasonable allowance for one meal for each practice and home game, and actual and necessary travel expenses to practice and home games.

Signature

Subscribed and sworn to before me

this _____ day of _____, 19____
Notarial Seal

Notary Public

65th ANNUAL CONVENTION

OTHER PROPOSALS

[NOTE: The following proposals were approved by the Council or Executive Committee during 1970. Those letters and words which have been deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which have been added appear in **bold face**. All page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1970-71 NCAA Manual.]

CONDUCT OF MEETS AND TOURNAMENTS

No. 36. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 1, by adding a new fourth paragraph, page 69, as follows:

"A meet or tournament committee or games committee may not require membership in any specific officials association as a prerequisite for selection to officiate in an NCAA meet or tournament."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Action: Approved.

DEFICITS

No. 37. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 10, by adding new paragraph (c), page 76, as follows:

"(c) If a deficit (exclusive of the cost of meetings, hospitality, banquets and other social activities) still exists after the Association has paid for the awards, the NCAA shall assume fifty per cent of the deficit up to the amount of \$500 in cost to the NCAA."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Action: Approved.

DISTRIBUTION OF NET RECEIPTS FOR TEAM CHAMPIONSHIPS

No. 38. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 9, by adding a new paragraph (h), page 76, as follows:

"(h) Volleyball. Net receipts from the National Collegiate Volleyball Championship shall be forwarded to the NCAA executive office to be distributed according to the following formula:

"(1) Expense allowances shall be paid for an official party of twelve persons on the basis of the actual cost of transportation up to first-class, round-trip railroad fare and standard Pullman, or commercial air fare, not to exceed jet coach, and a per diem allowance approved by the Executive Committee.

"(2) Any balance of net receipts remaining, after deducting the expenses specified in paragraph (1), shall be divided evenly between the NCAA and the competing institutions, with the institutions' share to be distributed evenly among them."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Action: Approved.

DISTRIBUTION OF NET RECEIPTS FOR TEAM CHAMPIONSHIPS

No. 39. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 9, by adding a new paragraph (i), page 76, as follows:

"(i) Water Polo. Net receipts from the National Collegiate Water Polo Championship shall be forwarded to the NCAA executive office to be distributed according to the following formula:

"(1) Expense allowances shall be paid for an official party of eighteen persons on the basis of the actual cost of transportation up to first-class, round-trip railroad fare and standard Pullman, or commercial air fare not to exceed jet coach, and a per diem allowance approved by the Executive Committee.

"(2) Any balance of net receipts remaining, after deducting the expenses specified in paragraph (1), shall be divided evenly between the NCAA and the competing institutions, with the institutions' share to be distributed evenly among them."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Action: Approved.

SUNDAY COMPETITION

No. 40. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 12, third paragraph, page 77, as follows:

"NCAA championship competition shall not be scheduled or conducted on Sunday, except that as provided in the following sentence; however, if an emergency develops which causes postponement of an NCAA event, or if the competitive situation dictates a more expeditious completion of the meet or tournament, Sunday competition may be permitted provided the competing institutions are agreeable and advance approval is obtained from the NCAA Officers. It is understood that institutional approval shall be sought after selection, but prior to participation in NCAA events. Games of the National Collegiate and National College Division Baseball Championships may be scheduled on Sunday afternoon or evening; however, if a participating institution has a policy against Sunday competition, the tournament schedule shall be adjusted to accommodate that institution and such adjustment shall not require its team to play sooner than when it was originally scheduled."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Action: Approved.

PROGRAM ADVERTISING

No. 41. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 13, first paragraph, page 77, as follows:

"Section 13. Program Advertising. Spencer Marketing Services, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016, is the official national advertising representative for the official programs issued in connection with NCAA events. The sale of all national adver-

tising for these programs shall be handled through this organization."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Action: Approved.

ADVERTISING

No. 42. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2 by deleting the last two paragraphs from Sections 13, 14 and 15, and adding Section 16, page 78, as follows:

"Section 16. Advertising. Association policy governing acceptable advertisers and advertising copy for game programs, broadcasts and telecasts of NCAA championship events excludes the following: alcoholic beverages (except malt beverages), political organizations, feminine hygiene products and professional sports organizations or personnel. Malt beverage advertising may be used without restriction in game programs consistent with the policies of the host institution; however, only one such commercial may be used in a broadcast or telecast and it must be preceded by an announcement indicating origination of the program is returning to the station's broadcasting studio.

"Advertisements are not acceptable which contain references to or photographs of the games, personnel, broadcasts, telecasts or other activities of professional sports organizations. In addition, drugs and patent medicines are generally excluded, particularly tonics and laxatives; however, analgesics, cold remedies and antacids which are in general use are acceptable. Institutional advertising by pharmaceutical firms also is acceptable.

"No commercial may relate, directly or indirectly, the advertising company or the advertised product to the institutions or athletes involved, or the NCAA itself."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

COMMITTEE EXPENSES

No. 43. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 3, Section 2-(a), page 79, as follows:

"(a) The payment of expenses of the members of the several rules committees for attendance at meetings of such committees shall be limited to one committee meeting per year for each committee, and shall cover actual transportation expenses up to the amount of commercial airline fare or first class railroad fare and standard Pullman, or eight cents per mile allowance for travel by automobile, together with a per diem allowance of \$25 \$30, all statements to be approved in writing by the committee chairman. Meetings of rules committees shall be held at places and times other than those authorized for the National Collegiate Championship events of their respective sports and shall be limited to two days (plus travel time) for the purposes of NCAA expenses hereinabove described, unless other arrangements have been approved by the NCAA Executive Committee. [The Executive Committee has authorized the Baseball, Basketball, Soccer, Track and Field

and Wrestling Rules and Meet or Tournament Committees to meet at the sites of their respective championship events.]”

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Action: Approved.

COMMITTEE EXPENSES

No. 44. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 3, Section 2-(b), page 79, as follows:

“(b) The payment of expenses of the members of the Executive Committee for attendance at meetings of the Committee shall be limited to actual transportation expenses up to the amount of commercial airline fare or first class railroad fare and standard Pullman, or eight cents per mile allowance for travel by automobile, together with a per diem allowance of \$25 \$30, all statements to be approved in writing by either the secretary-treasurer or the executive director.”

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Action: Approved.

COMMITTEE EXPENSES

No. 45. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 3, Section 2-(c), page 79, as follows:

“(c) The payment of expenses of the members of the Council for attendance at meetings of the Council shall be limited to actual transportation expenses up to the amount of commercial airline fare or first class railroad fare and standard Pullman, or eight cents per mile allowance for travel by automobile, together with a per diem allowance of \$25 \$30, all statements to be approved in writing by either the secretary-treasurer or the executive director.”

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Action: Approved.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

No. 46. Recommended Policies: Add a new Policy 10, page 83, as follows:

“Medical Examinations. Member institutions should require that all members of their intercollegiate athletic teams be given annual medical examinations.”

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

Action: Approved by voice vote.

ALIEN STUDENT-ATHLETES

No. 47. Resolution:

“Whereas, the National Collegiate Athletic Association made effective through Council approval in October, 1970, an Official Interpretation requiring alien student-athletes to qualify for financial aid and establish eligibility for practice and participation under Bylaw 4-6-(b) on the same basis as United States student-athletes, and

“Whereas, this basis is premised on experience tables developed only for United States students, and

“Whereas, these experience tables are based so importantly on the student-athlete's score on SAT and ACT examinations, and

“Whereas, these tests were not intended nor do they claim to measure scholastic competency of the alien student-athlete, and

“Whereas, these tests' cultural orientation and time factors militate drastically against all but the United States student, but

“Whereas, it is both necessary and desirable under Bylaw 4-6-(b) to establish qualification for financial aid and eligibility for practice and participation for the alien student-athlete,

“Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that a minimum necessary high school grade point average of 2.00 be established for qualification by the alien student-athlete under Bylaw 4-6-(b) without any requirement for a tabular prediction based on SAT or ACT examination as was the case prior to the October Council interpretation, and

“Be It Finally Resolved, that such resolution shall be effective for one year from this date.”

(Note: It is the intent of this resolution that if the grade point average of the alien student-athlete cannot be determined that the October Council-adopted interpretation remain in force, namely that relief may be obtained through proper petition in writing to the NCAA by authorized admissions personnel of the member institution.)

Source: Western Athletic Conference.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

DRUGS

No. 48. Resolution:

“Whereas, non-therapeutic drug usage described as doping is reported to be on the increase in the general college and youth population, and

“Whereas, the NCAA always has been opposed to non-therapeutic drug usage by student-athletes,

“Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA affirms its unequivocal condemnation of the employment of non-therapeutic drugs in any of its member institutions or affiliated organizations by staff members who authorize or allow their student-athletes to use such drugs and by student-athletes who do use such drugs,

“Be It Further Resolved, that all member institutions, their athletic staffs and their student-athletes aggressively assert their wholesome influences in combating usage of non-therapeutic drugs among the nation's youth, and

“Be It Finally Resolved, that staff members or student-athletes who use drugs in a non-therapeutic manner in any athletic programs are in violation of the Principles of Ethical Conduct of the NCAA.”

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

Appendix B

65th ANNUAL CONVENTION

Nominating Committee

Chairman—H. Boyd McWhorter

District 1—Robert W. Pritchard, Worcester Polytechnic Institute
District 2—Mox A. Weber, Hamilton College
District 3—H. Boyd McWhorter, University of Georgia
District 4—J. William Orwig, Indiana University
District 5—David Swank, University of Oklahoma
District 6—Kenneth Herrick, Texas Christian University
District 7—Louis A. Myers, University of Arizona
District 8—Cecil N. Coleman, Fresno State College
At-Large—Harry Arlanson, Tufts University
At-Large—Harvey C. Chrouser, Wheaton College
At-Large—William Exum, Kentucky State College

Committee on Committees

Chairman—Robert C. James

District 1—Seaver Peters, Dartmouth College
District 2—Raymond J. Whispell, Muhlenberg College
District 3—Lloyd P. Jordan, Southern Conference
District 4—James C. Loveless, DePauw University
District 5—G. Clayton Stapleton, Iowa State University
District 6—Harold Jeskey, Southern Methodist University
District 7—George C. McCarty, University of Texas, El Paso
District 8—Paul Rundell, San Francisco State College
At-Large—C. D. Henry, Grambling College
At-Large—J. Neil Stahley, Portland State University
At-Large—Robert C. James, Mid-American Conference

Committee on Voting

Chairman—William Maybry

District 1—Harold S. Westerman, University of Maine, Orono
District 2—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University
District 3—John R. Bell, East Tennessee State University
District 4—Thomas J. Frericks, Dayton University
District 5—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
District 6—Ulysses S. Jones, Southern University
District 7—Milton F. Hartvigsen, Brigham Young University
District 8—William L. Lakie, University of California, Davis
At-Large—William Maybry, Southwestern College (Tenn.)

Committee on Memorial Resolutions

Chairman—John J. Horgan

William Exum, Kentucky State College
John J. Horgan, Seton Hall University
Edwin P. Horner, Baylor University

Committee on Credentials

Chairman—R. R. Ritchie

Carl Abner, University of Louisville
J. Lewis Comer, California State College, Hayward
R. R. Ritchie, Clemson University

Parliamentarian

Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan

Chairman of Business Sessions

Harry M. Cross, University of Washington

Chairman of Round Tables

William J. Flynn, Boston College
Robert W. Pritchard, Worcester Polytechnic Institute

Appendix C

Past and Present Officers of the NCAA

President

1906-1913	Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1914-1916	LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
1917-1929	Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1930-1932	Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
1933-1937	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1938-1940	William B. Owens, Stanford University
1941-1944	Philip O. Badger, New York University
1945-1946	Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
1947-1949	Karl E. Leib, University of Iowa
1950-1952	Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
1953-1954	Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama
1955-1956	Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
1957-1958	Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
1959-1960	Herbert J. Dorricott, Western Colorado State College
1961-1962	Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
1963-1964	Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
1965-1966	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1967-1968	Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
1969-1970	Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
1971	Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee

Secretary-Treasurer

*1906-1908	Louis A. Bevier, Jr., Rutgers University
*1908	William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia
1909-1939	Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
1940-1944	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1945-1951	Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference
1952-1954	Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska
1955-1956	Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
1957-1958	Edwin D. Mouzon, Jr., Southern Methodist University
1959-1960	Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
1961-1962	Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
1963-1964	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1965-1966	Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
1967-1968	Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
1969-1970	William J. Flynn, Boston College
1971	Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University

*Bevier served as secretary, Lambeth as treasurer, in 1908.

Appendix D

NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1973

(Hotels in parentheses.)

*38th	1944	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (Saint Francis)
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)

*NOTE: Prior to 1944, the annual Convention was held in December. No meeting was held in 1943 and commencing with 1944 the Convention has been held in January.

1972 Convention

Diplomat Hotel, Hollywood, Florida, January 6-8

1973 Convention

Palmer House, Chicago Illinois, January 11-13

NATL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOC



1NCA000003087V

